

DIX

A2521

**Fidel's Sister Warned Dominicans  
of Revolt**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DONALD RUMSFELD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 18, 1965*

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, to those who doubt that the Communist threat in Latin America is very real, I call attention to the following story carried in the American edition of the Times of Havana, April 1965, of the warning given by the sister of Fidel Castro to the Dominicans that a revolt was being planned in their country. This is a timely reminder of the well-known Communist strategy for political takeover in countries undergoing social, economic, and political change.

The article follows:

**FIDEL'S SISTER WARNED DOMINICANS OF  
REVOLT**

"I know that Castro wants to take over this country."

The speaker was Fidel's sister, Juanita, and the country she had in mind was the Dominican Republic. She should know.

Early in April Juanita Castro spoke to the Dominican people at Santo Domingo, the capital city. Three weeks later the tragic revolution against law and order began.

"The Cubans," Juanita said, "Do not want the Dominican Republic to travel along democratic paths so that it will become a happy and progressive people."

**BROKE WITH FIDEL**

She recalled that her brother, Fidel, had been very happy about 3 years ago when he told her that his agents had "cleared the path" for the future.

Juanita fled Cuba about a year ago. She went to Mexico and since that time has traveled throughout the hemisphere.

Some Cuban sources in the underground used to count on her help even while she was still in Cuba. It was long suspected that she would come to a final break with Fidel. This finally happened about a year ago.

**WARNING**

Less than a month ago she warned the Dominicans that "He has tried to take your country several times. This is not the first time. It will not be the last time that Communist imperialism will use its Caribbean puppet."

She reported that Castro had ordered his agents "to infiltrate all sectors, professional, economic, labor, agriculture, and among students since communism always tries to find allies to reach power and then eliminate."

To block democratic processes at Santo Domingo "many of the local leaders of the Dominican Popular Socialist Party received training in subversion in Cuba."

"The Castro Communists have many tactics. They capture prospects and turn them into fanatics. What Lenin used to call useful idiots. They fall for false promises and are soon used for subversion. In the end they are jailed or shot."

**EXILE OPINION**

Miami's Cuban colony knows that only quick U.S. action kept the Dominican Republic from taking Castro's road to communism.

They have been through it once. They know it when they see it a second time. Where, they ask, did the thousands of Castro

STAT

A2522

CONC

olive green uniforms come from on the first day of the revolt? The answer to them is clear: from Cuba.

But Fidel's sister called the shots on Santo Domingo. And she did it on the spot just 3 weeks before it happened.

**"Preserving Competition"—Statement  
Supporting the Enactment of the  
Quality Stabilization Act of 1965**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 20, 1965*

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the 1930's many manufacturers, trade associations, independent retailers, State legislators, and Congressmen have worked for the enactment of various forms of legislation which would eliminate or control certain unfair trade practices associated with the resale of brand name commodities. Traditionally attempts have been made on both a national and State level to legislate against such abuses as false advertising, bait merchandising, and excessive price cutting. During this period some of these attempts have been enacted into law, while others have failed of enactment or have been negated by court decisions following their passage. In seeking to eliminate these trade abuses, the proponents of fair trade legislation over the years have continuously argued that such abuses, if left unchecked, would seriously threaten the proper functioning of the American free enterprise system.

Ever since my election to Congress in November of last year, I have devoted a considerable amount of time and study to this matter and I have now come to the conclusion that the Congress of the United States at the earliest possible date must enact a law which would provide added protection to the American businessman from certain unfair and harmful trade practices still being engaged in on a rather wide scale by unscrupulous participants in the free enterprise system. Shortly after reaching the conclusion that additional legislation was needed, I introduced a bill on May 10 of this year, H.R. 7841, which calls for the immediate enactment of a law to be known as the Quality Stabilization Act.

In short this bill, which is quite similar to those introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses, seeks the elimination of certain unfair trade practices which I, along with other proponents of such legislation, believe not only tend toward monopoly but seriously affect the quality and good name of name-brand commodities. Moreover, and probably most important, this bill would permit a manufacturer or owner of a brand, name or trademark, to protect his property rights attached to a brand, name, or trademark by establishing a price or price range at which goods carrying that brand, name, or trademark may be sold by wholesalers and retailers in the marketplace. I wish

tion projects, or to project areas or facilities authorized by law for inclusion within a national recreation area or appropriate for administration by a Federal agency as a part of the national forest system, as a part of the public lands classified for retention in Federal ownership, or in connection with an authorized Federal program for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "non-reimbursable" shall not be construed to prohibit the imposition of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges.

(f) Subsection 6(a)(2) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) shall not apply to costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement which are borne by the United States as a nonreimbursable project cost pursuant to subsection 2(a) or subsection 3(b)(1) of this Act.

(g) All payments and repayment by non-Federal public bodies under the provisions of this Act, and revenue from the conveyance by deed, lease, or otherwise, of lands under subsection 3(b)(2) of this Act, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized as a part of any water resource development project under his control heretofore authorized, except projects or areas within national wildlife refuges, to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, such as boat ramps, picnic tables, beach areas, sanitation facilities, and parking areas of a total cost not to exceed \$50,000 for each water resource project.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the administration of project land and water areas and the operations, maintenance, and replacement of facilities and to transfer project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes.

(b) No lands under the jurisdiction of any other Federal agency may be included for or devoted to recreation purposes under the authority of this Act without the consent of the head of such agency; and the head of any such agency is authorized to transfer any such lands to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of this Act. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to transfer jurisdiction over project lands within or adjacent to the exterior boundaries of national forests and facilities thereon to the Secretary of Agriculture for recreation and other national forest system purposes; and such transfer shall be made in each case in which the project reservoir area is located wholly within the exterior boundaries of a national forest unless the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior jointly determine otherwise. Where any project lands are transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the lands involved shall become national forest lands: *Provided*, That the lands and waters within the flow lines of any reservoir or otherwise needed or used for the operation of the project for other purposes shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he determines to be necessary for such operation. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects or to disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

SEC. 9. Effective on and after January 1, 1966, neither the Secretary of the Interior nor any bureau nor any person acting under his authority shall engage in the preparation

of any feasibility report with respect to any water resource project unless the preparation of such feasibility report has been specifically authorized by law or specifically directed by either the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by a resolution adopted by such committee, any other provision of law notwithstanding.

SEC. 10. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "project" shall mean a project or any appropriate unit thereof.

(b) The term "cost" shall mean the value of goods and services (land, labor, and supplies) used for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the project.

(c) The term "separable costs" shall mean the cost for each project purpose which is the difference between the cost of the multiple-purpose project and the cost of the project with the purpose omitted.

(d) The term "joint costs" shall mean the difference between the cost of the multiple-purpose project as a whole and the total of the separable costs for all project purposes.

(e) The term "feasibility report" shall mean any report of the scope required by the Congress when formally considering authorization of the project of which the report treats.

SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Water Project Recreation Act".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

MR. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: "Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H.R. 5269 as passed by the House."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5269) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

MR. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### INCIDENT AT BIEN HOA, VIETNAM

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there have appeared in the press some rather detailed accounts of the unfortunate incident at Bien Hoa airfield in Vietnam. This catastrophe resulted in the loss of life of some of our finest air crews and maintenance personnel.

As soon as he heard of this tragic event, General McConnell, the able Chief of Staff of the Air Force, immediately dispatched to Vietnam a team of his most experienced and competent personnel under the Inspector General, Lt. Gen. William K. Martin, to inquire into this incident.

The Committee on Armed Services was notified and has been briefed on this affair.

Obviously, there will be a great amount of speculation and postulating about our activities at this base in an effort to explain, or condemn, the cause of the explosions.

I remind all who are aroused, as I am, and as we all should be, by this incident, to remember our overall aims and objectives in Vietnam.

The Air Force is keeping us advised—it is making a thorough investigation of the affair—we still are fighting the Vietcong—we still have security problems—we still have to win a war.

Therefore, I urge everyone to refrain from any unnecessary discussion of the details of this incident, which could reveal classified information and jeopardize our military efforts.

To those who gave their lives so unexpectedly, yet so gallantly, we owe a reflective pause.

When the facts are known, they will be disclosed to the extent that security will permit.

I can assure you of this, and I hope and pray that you will help. We need help.

Thank you very much.



DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was heartened by the report in this morning's newspaper that the White House mission to the Dominican Republic, headed by McGeorge Bundy, was attempting to obtain the resignation of the Imbert junta and restoration of a constitutional government under the direction of persons associated with the party and program which received the overwhelming support of the Dominican people in the only free election held in that unhappy nation in over 30 years.

It is my fervent hope that we will persevere in these efforts in spite of the predictable reaction of the junta leadership which evidently equates popular government and opposition to military dictatorship with communism.

While it is proper and essential that the United States be determined to prevent the establishment of Communist-oriented governments in the Americas, it is equally important that we demonstrate a solid commitment to the creation and support of democratic and constitutional governments.

If we fail to demonstrate convincingly our hemisphere commitment to popular government, we will have let down the people of the Dominican Republic and our friends throughout Latin America and will have severely damaged our relations with other nations in the Western Hemisphere.

The twin objectives of opposition to Communist imperialism and support for democratic government are not mutually irreconcilable.

In the Dominican Republic, assuming the accuracy of our assessment of an at-

STAT

tempted Communist takeover of the revolution, it must nevertheless be conceded that the forces of rebellion include a sizable cross section of Dominicans committed to constitutional government which is overwhelmingly non-Communist in its orientation. It is our responsibility to work with the democratic elements of the revolution and to insist upon the creation of a constitutional regime committed to the social and economic principles endorsed by the Dominican people in the 1962 elections.

Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann's column in this morning Washington Post, entitled "The Cornerstone of a Policy," succinctly expresses the problems we face in the Dominican Republic and the principles to which we must adhere. Under permission granted, I include the text of Mr. Lippmann's column at this point in the RECORD:

THE CORNERSTONE OF A POLICY  
(By Walter Lippmann)

There is, we can be sure, no quick way out of the Dominican affair. There is no solution available which will not, even with the best of luck, take a long time. There is no prospect of our being able to withdraw soon leaving behind some sort of reasonably democratic and stable government.

The reason why the future is so difficult is that during the 30 years in which Trujillo ruled the Dominican Republic, he exterminated or drove into exile or into hiding all the educated, competent public men who did not take part in his cruel and corrupt tyranny. The men who should have taken over power after Trujillo are a lost generation. Dr. Bosch spent the Trujillo years in exile, and therefore he had no practical experience in Dominican politics before becoming President.

It is this lack of able and honest and progressive leaders which is the fundamental difficulty in extricating ourselves from the embarrassing and ominous situation in which we find ourselves. There is the reactionary military junta, which represents a revival of the Trujillist oligarchy, and there are the constitutionalists, who represent the bitter discontent of the Dominican masses. They are without practical experience in government, and they are vulnerable therefore to infiltration from agents of or sympathizers with Castro. Between these two groups there is nothing, no middle group of eminent and respectable men who could provide a caretaker government.

The predicament of the United States arises from the fact that it may take the OAS and the U.N. years to overcome the political vacuum, to find, to promote, to defend and to finance a government which can be independent because it rests on popular consent. In the past one alternative would have been an indefinitely prolonged U.S. occupation of the Dominican Republic, ruled by a high commissioner who is not a Dominican. It is too late in the day for that. This sort of solution is not acceptable in the modern world. Another alternative, which has been favored by the State Department, is a coalition government. Caamaño would represent the constitutionalists and Imbert the military junta. Almost certainly, this is not really a valid option. It proposes to ignore the depth and the width of the conflict between those who are fighting to perpetuate the inheritance of Trujillo and those for whom life is intolerable without far-reaching progressive reforms.

The first requirement of U.S. policy is that the President make himself free and uncommitted, and specifically that our troops cease to favor the military junta in the civil war.

It is as certain as anything can be in a situation of this kind that a workable policy must invoke the principle of legitimacy and must be directed to progressive reform. Legitimacy is important because only a government which derives from the only genuine election the Dominicans have ever known can hope to command the confidence and respect of the Dominican masses.

It is no doubt true that Dr. Bosch was a weak President. But he is the only Dominican who has ever been genuinely elected, and therefore the political succession from him to Caamaño should be respected and observed. The government which the OAS backs, and we along with it, should have as its cornerstone the Constitutionalist Party.

It would be strange indeed if there were no Communists in the Constitutionalist Party. But there is no evidence whatever that they are in control of the party and, considering the certainty that troops will remain in the Dominican Republic for a considerable time to come, there should be no serious danger that the Communists, admittedly a small number, could take over as they did in Cuba. In view of the power deployed in and around the island, the threat of a Soviet intervention to support a Communist coup seems to be small. It is so small that it is a risk we can well afford to take.

There are two great advantages to be had from treating the Constitutionalist Party as the cornerstone of a new government. The first is that with good advice from its Latin American neighbors, and with plentiful economic assistance from us, such a government would be the one most likely to succeed.

The second advantage is that this decision on our part is the only one that can prove our good faith, which is profoundly suspected throughout the hemisphere. For the decision to make the Constitutionalist Party the cornerstone will be the certain proof that President Johnson did not intervene in order to support a military dictatorship working for reactionary interests, and that he is in fact genuinely committed to popular progressive reform.

There is no real alternative to this line of policy. For no government can be built around the military junta which has any hope of winning the support of the Dominican people or of obtaining approval from our Latin American neighbors.

#### RESOLUTION FOR UPDATING IMMIGRATION LAWS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a resolution.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1965, the City Council of the City of Chicago and its distinguished mayor, Hon. Richard J. Daley, adopted a resolution urging the enactment of pending legislation for liberalizing our immigration laws. This resolution represents the overwhelming attitude of almost 4 million people who reside in the city of Chicago. The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO URGING ENACTMENT OF PENDING LEGISLATION FOR UPDATING IMMIGRATION LAWS

Whereas four previous administrations of the United States of America and four Presidents of the United States, including former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, the late John F. Kennedy and the incumbent, Lyndon B. Johnson, have each declared that the present quota system for immigration into the United States of America was false and unworthy in 1924 and

is even worse, now, and completely contrary to the ideals and philosophy of America and that which made America great: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the City Council of the City of Chicago, in session assembled, hereby memorialize the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America to support and pass pending immigration legislation in said Congress, known as Senate bill 500 and House of Representatives bill 2580; and that it is the sense of this city council that our current immigration laws should be enlarged, amended, and brought into conformity with our basic desires of continuing to make America available to deserving immigration on a fair and equitable basis.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND PROPOSED VA HOSPITAL CLOSINGS

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the budgetary recommendations of the independent offices I want to particularly discuss the appropriations as they relate to the Veterans' Administration.

It was my privilege to chair the hearings on this agency and I, therefore, feel that I can speak with some familiarity of the inner workings and the programs of the agency.

I know there is much concern about the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital closings. Our committee has given full and thorough consideration to the matter. The hearings will document each individual project in which Members are interested.

I personally questioned the Veterans' Administration Administrator, Mr. William J. Driver, and the Chief Medical Director, Dr. J. H. McNinch, regarding every one of the hospitals concerned in the proposed closing—as to location, conditions, number of patients at each hospital, and the reason for the proposed closing.

All of this is documented in the hearings.

As you know, the President has appointed a blue-ribbon Committee headed by James G. Gleason, former Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, to study and consider this matter. This committee is currently engaged in this study.

Also, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman OLIN TEAGUE, is looking into the closings. When these reports are in, we will be in a better position to make a judgment in this matter.

We have the greatest veterans program of any nation in the world. Our committee recommended a total of \$5,663,192,000 for all the programs of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal 1966. This is an increase of \$22,445,000 over the budget for fiscal 1965.

The bill includes an appropriation of \$1,177,417,000 for medical care. We did not cut the medical care program by one dime. In fact, we increased the Vet-



May 18, 1965

slow moving, then the small business mouse nibbling at its feet can be frightening.

What's needed here as an antidote is for executives in the top echelons to think of the organization as compact, muscular, and alert.

2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of small rivals. Companies often oversimplify the capabilities of an opponent. Stunned by the speed with which a small competitor was able to service an account, a steel supplier spent considerable time hashing over possible countermeasures. It wasn't until the marketing director pointed out that the rival's capabilities were limited to just a few items that the problem was seen in perspective.

The big company must learn to avoid getting involved in exhausting guerrilla warfare in the competitor's areas of strength. Technology, the traditional big gun of the large firm, should be used wisely in this connection.

The small firm is likely to remain strong in operations not subject to the computer revolution—unique products, custom production, personal and special services that machines can't handle. The larger firm can afford to be selective; in some cases, deciding not to become active in a given area may be the height of wisdom.

3. Adopt the small company's sense of time. An employee of a large food company recently set about looking for a new job, complaining: "Frankly, I'm frightened. I find myself taking 4 hours to do something I know I can do in an hour and a half. This is no way to work. I want a job that stimulates me, not one that puts me to sleep." The point is, the company expects the assignment to take 4 hours.

Despite widespread acceptance of Parkinson's law, that work expands to fit the time available to do it, many larger companies often operate under lax work schedules. This doesn't mean you should put on the screws. But workload and work pace should be in keeping with individual capacity.

The benefits to be gained are not only increased efficiency, but also heightened satisfaction and the self-esteem of the individual who feels he's carrying a man's load.

The larger company that thinks a sure-fire method of acquiring a small-company sense of time is to hire it must be cautious. "An executive moving from a small company to a large one often faces difficulties," comments recruiting consultant Kiernan, who has seen numerous examples of such transfers. "Many a fine performer in the small firm flounders and can't seem to mesh in a big organization. On the other hand, many men who grow up in small companies may reach a point where their experience, maturity and desire to grow give them the basis for success in a larger company. It depends on the individual, his personality and adaptability."

4. Decentralize selectively. Practitioners of organizational planning often admit confusion when faced with the time-honored dilemma of the centralize-decentralize saw-saw. Without the recentralization that results from automation and the use of computers, the idea of decentralizing may seem impractical. Nevertheless, large organizations have discovered some functions may remain centralized while others are decentralized.

When line functions can be put in the latter category, the shortening of communications lines, the increased flexibility of action can put the big company, at least in selected areas, more on a par with the smaller firm.

5. Centralize selectively. The small company generally benefits from short and uncomplicated communications lines. In addition, the fewer waystations there are in a communications link, the easier it becomes for informal communications to operate.

While informal communications are less

practical for the larger firm, new technological advances make instant communication possible. For example, computers for loading rail and air passenger carriers, hotel bookings and so on now make it possible to centralize scheduling, warehousing, filing systems and the like, regardless of how extensive they may be.

Entire functions, such as purchasing, payroll, inventory control, also may be centralized for larger firms, using computerized equipment and advanced information retrieval systems.

6. Emphasize small group loyalty and identification. A sufficient number of studies, as well as common experience, have established the fact that the individual can develop great emotional ties to a business.

Members' loyalties and emotional involvement tend to be stronger in relation to subordinate groups than to the bigger organization. The college alumnus tends to have stronger ties to the class of '46 than to the university as a whole. Similarly, the employee has greater feeling for the department in which he operates than for the company as a whole.

The organization that makes it possible for the individual to develop a sense of identity with his department or immediate work group by treating it as a unit can expect more in the way of loyalty and interest in job objectives.

But here's where many companies lull themselves into dangerous complacency by so-called "enlightened policies"—such as that of the "open door"—designed to give employees a feeling of closeness to executives and the company.

Says Hermon H. Scott, president of H. H. Scott, of Maynard, Mass., hi-fi equipment manufacturer: "In a small company, the top executives are generally available to anybody at any time within reason. In the big company, even though the top man may be in the same building, it is difficult for anyone to see him without an appointment, open door policy or not."

Or, as one disgruntled employee put it: "Sure, my boss' door is open—so he can kick people out."

7. Check for organizational blockage. Removal of organizational obstacles can put big company reflexes more on a par with the smaller firm. Managers are familiar with bottlenecks in production. Somewhat the same thing may take place with management procedures. A decision may get hung up somewhere along a chain of command; a communication may fail to penetrate a middle echelon. A number of specific questions can help pinpoint the bottlenecks:

If there is insufficient flow of ideas upward, where is the transmission failure?

If decisionmaking and implementation are unsatisfactory, where does the hesitation, buckpassing or failure to act take place?

What department tends to get out of step in carrying out company policy? Studies have indicated that everything from pilferage to higher absence rates results from communication blockages typical of some large firms.

Equally important is the need to distinguish between quantity and quality of communication. A weekly house organ may seem a worthwhile medium but is useless if nobody reads it. Failure to distinguish between going through the motions and actually producing results is often at the root of poor communications in the larger firm.

As for decision-making, often a major big-company problem, specific procedures tend to point up action-blockage:

Over-use of committees: In some companies, there is a tendency toward proliferation of committees for anything and everything—planning, problem-solving, development of ideas.

In other instances, procedures normally given over to one executive are made the responsibility of many. A typical example

is the hiring committee. An executive job opening is filled when a committee finally selects the best candidate. The trouble is that under this practice the man who usually gets the job may not be the best man at all, but merely the one to whom no one on the committee objects.

Foggy lines of authority: In some cases, necessary decisions are delayed because of the question of who has the authority to decide. Traditionally, this problem has involved line and staff executives in controversy. In many cases, the personalities of the respective executives cause the confusion. The problem may assume a variety of shapes:

A power-minded top executive may insist on making decisions handled by a subordinate.

An indecisive executive may try to pass a critical decision either up or down the line. The small-firm executive usually lacks this alternative, and therefore tends to make the decisions required anywhere in his area of responsibility.

The big company can force the same degree of decisiveness on its managers by clarifying its policies and procedures of decision-making, pinning down who is responsible for what, seeing that necessary decisions are not delayed. An occasional decision review to see how executives have been scoring with their decisions can clear the lines and stimulate the process.

Larger firms must also be careful to reward individual enterprise.

Big companies sometimes tend to build an atmosphere of apathy and an attitude of let's play it safe. This can only be dissipated by positive policies and action by the company. When an organization, by its rewards—promotion, salary increases, and so on—shows that it appreciates original thinking and responsible, tradition-breaking action, it fosters the creativity and drive it must have at all levels to keep moving ahead.

Incidentally, the assumption that big companies pay higher salaries than small ones is not generally substantiated: "There's not much difference in starting salaries between large and small firms," observes Hermon Scott. "Obviously, top salaries in the largest corporations are higher than any small company can pay. But actually, there are few such jobs. I would even go so far as to say that after the first couple of years, the average income for small-company executives tends to be higher than for larger companies."

Accordingly, discovering just how your salary levels compare with others in your industry and area may explain some mysteries of executive discontent and quitting.

The nature of our economy is such that there is a need for both large and small businesses. Certain services and products fall naturally within the sphere of each. Few small firms could produce an automobile, a computer, or an airplane. Few large firms can tie up large pieces of equipment with custom orders or highly specialized small runs. In between are areas in which big and small compete for customers. When this competition is carried on at high levels of efficiency, everyone benefits.

AUREN URIS,  
Research Institute of America.

## U.S. Policy in Defending Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the recent actions by the United States in Viet-

STAT

A2444

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 18, 1965

nam and in the Dominican Republic have brought a new determination and firmness to our policy of defending freedom in various sections of the globe where America has vital interests.

Basically, our military actions have served notice that we do not intend to follow a policy of appeasement wherever the Communists determine to test our will.

The essential meaning of this policy is recognized in several recent editorials published in the New York Journal-American and the New York World-Telegram. I ask unanimous consent to have three of these editorials printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Apr. 28, 1965]

L.B.J. STANDS FIRM

In recent weeks, even days, the war in Vietnam has escalated to its most dangerous level. U.S. marines have fought with Vietcong guerrillas, and the presence of regular North Vietnamese Army formations in South Vietnam has been reported by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Hence, it was widely speculated that President Johnson's news conference would provide news of major importance. But it is simply a measure of the consistency of American policy in the Far East that it did not.

President Johnson, looking solemn but confident, merely reaffirmed that the United States would not yield to aggression in that area and repeated his offer to talk peace "with any government, anywhere, anytime, without any conditions."

Thus there were no surprises, nor should there have been.

The President declined to speculate about the possible future outright commitment of American ground forces in Vietnam and gently chided those who queried him on whether nuclear weapons might be used in Vietnam. No one in the Government has ever brought the issue up, he told his listeners.

But in view of the fact that there are many in this country who still do not appear to have grasped the meaning of the American action in Vietnam, President Johnson appropriately reminded them that we have merely learned the lesson taught at Munich—that appeasement leads to war.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram, May 4, 1965]

OUR FIRMNESS

Because of our involvement in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, the United States is being treated to an overdose of world attention—much of it critical, and a lot of it, of course, not very well founded.

This is what we can expect for trying to be helpful all around, and for trying to look out for our own interests.

We have some hip-shooters in the British Parliament charging us with "monstrous aggression" for sending troops to the Dominican Republic. Newspaper editors in Europe and elsewhere are busy exporting the confused situation in Santo Domingo—and some who denounce the United States for intervening also say we should use our force to put former President Juan Bosch back in power.

Bosch seems to think so, too.

It would be nice to have everybody thinking we are wise, generous, and altogether pure. We have spent and given away billions of dollars to help others and thus, hopefully, to make ourselves better understood.

But we can't combat communism, repel armed aggression, rescue innocent souls trapped in mob scenes, or look after our own best interests and the general safety of free allies—and worry too much about our image all over the globe.

Our Government has to make decisions and sometimes they have to be made fast. We can't base decisions by guessing how everybody is going to react. The Communist governments are predictable, but everybody in friendly countries is not.

As the President said, we like friends, but when we have a job to do, we will go ahead and do it, "whether we make friends or lose them."

In the long run, the current squawks notwithstanding, we will make more friends by being honest with our own well-known principles, and acting on them.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, May 4, 1965]

WE KNOW THE FACT

The enemy is the same. The reason for the presence of American troops is the same. The only real difference between the U.S. military actions in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam—apart from their extent—is that they are taking place on different sides of the world.

In Vietnam, we are witnessing one phase of a long-term Communist plan to seize and subjugate a densely populated, rice rich region of southeast Asia. In the Dominican Republic it is a case of swift, skilled Communist exploitation of a tragic social eruption—with the identical aim of seizure and subjugation—this time in the strategic Caribbean.

There, in 1958, a submerged Communist element rode the crest of a wave of popular discontent, surfacing only when victory was achieved. Thus a bridgehead hostile to the United States was established in Cuba. It is simply the matter of U.S. national self-interest that this strategy of the overt or covered coup, by an armed, organized minority not be permitted to repeat itself, certainly not this close to home.

CAN'T TOLERATE THE MENACE

Let anyone take undue note of Soviet and other Communist rantings in the United Nations or elsewhere, let us recall Hungary. There in 1956 thousands of death-dealing Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest—because the Soviet Union was not prepared to permit a free, democratic state to establish itself near Russia's borders in Eastern Europe.

For the Soviet Union, freedom behind the Iron Curtain—as in West Berlin—is a menace. For the United States, communism in the Western Hemisphere—as in Cuba—is a menace.

Let the faint hearts and those who entertain qualms about our action in the Dominican Republic dwell upon this. Moreover it must be noted that the Charter of the U.N. itself expressly recognizes the right of nations to act when their fundamental national self-interests are threatened.

Finally, we are impressed by the decisiveness of President Johnson's dispatch of troops to the embattled Republic. In addition, we are dismayed by the display of logistics which brought so much to bear within so short a time. Let students of American muscle, whether friend or foe, ponder this and draw from it the appropriate lesson.

## Sherman's March Through the Carolinas

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 11 I had the privilege of attending a dinner given by the Civil War Round Table of the District of Columbia at the Army-Navy Club. Dr. John G. Barrett, professor of history at the Virginia Military Institute, was the speaker for the occasion, delivering a speech describing Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman's march through the Carolinas. He is the author of a book bearing that title.

Dr. Barrett's speech was most interesting and enlightening, bringing out many important facts and features about both the march and the man who led it. I consider the address of keen historic significance and worthy of being printed and preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave previously granted me to extend my remarks, I include the same, which is as follows:

## SHERMAN'S MARCH THROUGH THE CAROLINAS

Although William Tecumseh Sherman could not recall saying "War is hell," he did state: "You cannot qualify war in harsher terms than I will. War is cruelty and you cannot refine it." It was in the fall of 1862 that he developed his philosophy of total war which he thought would make conflict "so terrible" that the South would exhaust all peaceful remedies before commencing another struggle. Considering all the people of the South as enemies of the Union, Sherman planned to use his military forces against the civilian population as well as the armies of the enemy. He believed this plan of action would not only demoralize the non-combatants but also the men under arms.

The southern armies in the field, he felt certain, could be disheartened by attacks on the civilian population, as easily as by defeats on the battlefield. Sherman's program of total war also called for the destruction of the enemy's economic resources. By paralyzing the Confederate economy he hoped to destroy the South's ability to supply its fighting forces with war materials. Thus in bringing war to the homefront he hoped to destroy both the South's capacity to wage war and its will to fight.

"Collective responsibility," the theory upon which total war rests, made possible a new mode of warfare in which the accepted rules of the time were transgressed. The effect was a certain disregard for human rights and dignity. But with Sherman "war . . . [was] war and not popularity seeking." He thought the South, for its part in bringing on the conflict, deserved "all the curses and maledictions a people can pour out." Nevertheless, he held out to his enemies the sincere promise of helping hand if they would lay down their arms and rejoin the Union. It was not a sense of cruelty and barbarism that prompted Sherman to formulate his theory of total war. This conception was the outgrowth of a search for the quickest, surest, and most efficient means to win a struggle. Victory, he determined, could be



I should like to pay tribute to the outstanding personalities of the entertainment world who will appear on this night and who are paying their own expenses, paying for their own transportation, their room and board, and are contributing their talents in order for our home to net from the show on this night over \$200,000 which will be used to pay out the principal and the interest on the loan. These great entertainers, in the best of American traditions, are helping to create a private home for the aged solely by their own efforts and without depending on public funds. They are to be hailed and congratulated, not only by all the Members of Congress, but by the people of America, for their generosity and public-spirited interest in helping to build an institution that will eventually have over 350 golden agers spending the last days of their lives in the tranquility of this house of God.

Thank you, Jimmy Durante, Enzo Stuarti, Dean Martin, Connie Francis, Louis Prima with Sam Butera and The Witnesses, Vic Damone, Rocky Marcino, Ford and Mercer, Anna Marie, Jimmy Rona, The Salvinos, Jimmy Faro, and Lou Breese. My heart is full of joy—full of profound gratitude—to each and every one of these performers for their gracious contribution to Villa Scalabrini.

Too often we have heard that movie stars and entertainers show no interest in their communities and in the affairs of those less fortunate. Yet, this is a concrete example of the generous contributions that these great stars of radio, television, and the movies are making, day in and day out, to the American way of life. Throughout America, stars of all races, colors and creeds are contributing daily of their time and talents to benefit institutions which are trying to raise private funds to alleviate the suffering and the miseries of the poor. They are doing a tremendous job in helping to raise funds to combat juvenile delinquency, to aid the mentally retarded, to aid in the fight against cancer, to aid in the fight against heart disease, and countless other worthwhile causes.

How can we ever forget the contributions they made during World War I and World War II and the Korean war? How can we forget the programs they provided for our soldiers and the job they are still doing today entertaining our soldiers both at home and abroad?

We in America can be proud of the patriotism and the good will that these stars are showing toward their fellow man and their fellow Americans.

#### A REFERENDUM IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is keeping marines in the Dominican Republic for the announced purpose of maintaining law and order while a political settlement is worked out in the Organization of American

Our deeds, however, do not fully correspond with this policy. From daily press reports it appears that U.S. military forces have been working with the military junta. Whether or not this one-sided cooperation is inadvertent or even inevitable under the circumstances, our impartiality and good faith are brought into question. This apparent lack of impartiality is given further credence by some of our actions in the U.N., the OAS, and in the character of negotiations with the rebel group. Moreover, the mere passage of time tends to shift the relative balance of power between the two sides. This inevitably intensifies the anti-American feeling which is developing rapidly on that island.

Of the utmost importance, therefore, is the posture of the United States in reaching a political settlement. When the United States intervened, two forces were struggling for control of the Dominican Republic. Lives were being lost. Intervention could be justified on the grounds that the citizens of that nation should not be forced to accept a government which could muster the greater military power rather than the allegiance of the larger number of citizens.

We have sought a political settlement through the formation of a coalition government. Whether or not a coalition is being blocked by extremists on either side is uncertain, but delay in finding other political solutions will lead to further aggravation of this conflict. Moreover, even if a coalition government were formed, that such an uneasy coalition could successfully sponsor fair elections in the near future is open to serious question.

Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the United States should announce its support of a plan to permit the people of the Dominican Republic to choose one of the contending factions to serve as an interim government until regular elections can be held later. This referendum should be conducted—not just supervised—by the OAS or the U.N. The mode of carrying out such a referendum should be determined by the OAS or the U.N. in consultation with all sides, but should be carried out whether or not agreement is obtained from all sides. If necessary, mass media facilities should be imported and operated under international control to assure equal access by all sides. The United States should announce its support in advance for the victor at such a referendum.

We need to recognize that such a referendum might bring to power persons with whom we are in disagreement. It may bring to power persons who fail to recognize the antidemocratic character of the Communist movement or who choose to temporize with that movement. It may also bring to power persons who have shown little devotion to democratic procedures. It may be appropriate for the OAS or the U.N. to require that any faction represented on the referendum ballot make a commitment to sponsor free elections within a stated time.

Mr. Speaker, the course I recommend carries risks, but the risks are less than those we incur with other courses of action.

We have a bearcut by the tail. The OAS nations appear reluctant to come to our aid in solving the problems of the Dominican Republic. If we could announce our intentions now—and make them explicit—OAS nations should not hesitate to intervene more actively in support of these goals, but when our intentions are obscured as they largely are when we seek to manipulate the junta government to make it more attractive, lack of enthusiasm on the part of many OAS members is understandable.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. national interest will become increasingly jeopardized as we are drawn more deeply into the internal dispute in the Dominican Republic. We urgently need to proclaim now that our intervention continues for but one purpose: to give effect to the principle of national self-determination. Action needs to follow this proclamation. With this action we would stand proudly before the world community of nations as the defender of the right of people everywhere to choose their own government.

#### HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, DOCTOR OF LAWS

(Mr. KORNEGAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. Basil L. Whitener, is at Pfeiffer College, Milledgeville, N.C., today taking part in the commencement exercises of that outstanding institution. I am happy to say that the trustees of Pfeiffer College, recognizing the great contributions that our colleague has made to his State and Nation, are conferring upon him the degree of honorary doctor of laws.

I know of no one who more richly deserves to be honored today at Pfeiffer College than Basil Whitener. I am pleased that the college has recognized his outstanding record of public service and is conferring upon him the degree of honorary doctor of laws.

Mr. Speaker, Pfeiffer College is a splendid senior institution of higher learning located in the south central Piedmont section of North Carolina. Under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Lemuel Stokes the college has witnessed rapid growth in recent years. Pfeiffer College has an outstanding faculty, and the school is fulfilling a vital role in the field of higher education in North Carolina.

Our distinguished colleague who is being honored today at Pfeiffer College has always been interested in education. At an early date he developed an appreciation of the role that higher education has in the life of our Nation. Basil Whitener has always supported public and private efforts in behalf of education.

He was educated in the public schools of Gaston County, N.C.; Rutherford College; the University of South Carolina; and Duke University. Basil has a sister who is a schoolteacher, and he, himself, was an instructor in commercial law in Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, N.C., in 1939, 1940, and 1941.

May 17, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10291

things the world needs for peace and freedom and note the men who are meeting these needs today.

Who has made a greater contribution to world understanding among nations than the great, former Secretary of the United Nations, Trygve Lie. He knew that the United Nations was not perfect because it was an instrument of man, but he resolved to do his best to make it work. He knew that Norway, in her wisdom, was one of the first 24 nations to sign the United Nations Charter, and he knew the value that Norwegians place upon the rule of law.

The very introduction to Norway's ancient code of laws reads: "With law shall we build our land, and with lawlessness lay it waste."

Let us then in the spirit of Trygve Lie look upon international law, in the developing and evolving concept of the United Nations, as a freedom-loving world's best hope of reaching our aim of peace on earth.

This means that we are not ready to abandon the United Nations to oppressor nations to be used as they would be by Soviet or Chinese oppressors, or any other totalitarian forces on earth.

It also means that in the interest of the preservation of the United Nations we must insist upon all nations, large or small, living up to their obligations of membership—and this includes the payment of dues and just obligations without delay or abatement.

In the language of children, let it also be said that the rule of law live and let live which governs all international affairs is that any and all nations must abide by covenants and agreements and desist from acts of terror and anarchy.

This means that if Mr. Sukarno of Indonesia, and Mr. Nasser of Egypt persist in the burning of libraries given in friendship and the bombing of embassies placed for good will, then they must learn to live without our aid and without our friendship.

There is an end to American patience with anarchy just as there is no end to American faith in firm and friendly alliances.

Of these alliances, the Great Atlantic Community, as we know it in the NATO is cause to speak of the great contribution of other figures on the horizon of the world who are Norwegian.

The first, of course, is Prime Minister Einar Gerhardsen, who only this week reaffirmed the faith and enduring confidence of the Norwegian people in the United Nations.

The second is the man who is looked upon as a chief architect of the NATO alliance, the great Foreign Minister of Norway, Halvard Lange, who has done more than any man to preserve and perfect this great alliance as a barrier against aggression and a bulwark for the peace of Europe.

It is fitting also to note that the entire existence of NATO, one of its most able leaders and distinguished commanders has been Gen. Lauris Norstad, a courageous Norwegian-American from Minnesota.

I point to the work of these men, not because they owe their ancestry to Norway, but because their work truly represents the four great principles which underlie the Norwegian Constitution.

These four concepts are, of course:

1. National independence.
2. Sovereignty of the people.
3. A division of power.
4. The inviolable rights of the individual versus the state.

It is this last key concept which becomes more important day by day—the inviolable right of the individual. This we must communicate to our children in all its significance.

It is the supreme worth of the individual as a creature of God which we must identify, dramatize, and teach our children to appreciate in their time.

The supreme worth of the individual, the dignity of the human person, is a meaningful difference between the world of freedom, the world of America, of Norway, of all free nations, and the world behind the walls, the Berlin wall, the wall of China, the wall of Cuba. In the world of freedom, for our children.

We believe that dignity means at least these things.

Dignity demands freedom for all men to worship God and pray at will—and our children enjoy that right now and forever.

Dignity demands equality of opportunity to learn and to know in any school according to the desire of the parent. This means schools of equal quality, and we recognize this right and obligation because at all levels of government, local, State, and Federal, we will not rest until all children participate in the growth of knowledge to the limit of their capacity. We took a long first step toward that goal when President Lyndon Johnson signed the great Education Act of 1965 on April 11 of this year. I want to pay tribute to the part which Vice President Humphrey played in the preparation and passage of this act. I want to thank you for sending me to Congress to contribute what I could to this vital legislation.

Further dignity demands freedom from the threat of deadly illness and crippling disease for want of care and want of cure. We mean to respond to that in our time. I say here and now that our children must not grow up to learn that our land lags behind Norway and other countries in the care of our elders and the winning of the war against heart disease, stroke, and cancer—the scourge of man.

Dignity demands freedom from the oppression of poverty, want, and the indignity of the dole, for too many Americans need the kind of self-help that has made the land of Norway a haven of full enjoyment.

We must put into practice in this country through improvement in education and economic growth what Norway has had in her constitution since 1954 when the storthing approved this paragraph:

"The authorities are instructed to adjust things so that any fit human being can make himself a living by his work."

How simply stated—but how rich in meaning. Here is the great test of our system today. We must seek again for the benefit of our children to so develop our great enterprise system so that it can call upon all its resources and Government services as well—to adjust things—so that recession and depression are only memories and never prospects.

Norway has done it, and with a little Norwegian ingenuity, we can do it over here.

Finally, dignity demands that we live up to our covenant with all our fellow men on earth who seek to live with us in freedom and to resist oppression and enslavement.

Freedom cannot mean one thing at Eidsvoll in 1814 and another thing in Saigon or Santa Domingo in 1965.

In our time, as in that time, the call is for courage, for unity, for determination, and for understanding.

I say here and now that President Johnson, as leader of the free world and President of the greatest freedom-loving Nation in all of history, is giving us that leadership.

Of all your qualities, my Norwegian-American neighbors, your most characteristic trait is indomitable and fearless calm in the face of danger.

Leif Ericson, explorer of North America, faced all the ravages of weather and tempest, but he prevailed.

In his image and in our time Norwegians and Norwegian-American seamen were called upon to risk their lives in the treacherous sealanes of the Atlantic and the North Sea, and they prevailed in the cause of victory.

At Trondheim and Bereen, all the Nazi might could not smother the resistance of the Norwegians and they refused to bow to tyranny until they prevailed in 1944. Now the time has come to test this generation.

As the late President Kennedy said, "To few generations is given the opportunity of defending freedom in its hour of challenge—that challenge has come to this generation, and we do not shrink from it."

If we would have peace in their time and for all time for our children and their children, then we cannot compromise with aggression.

Let aggression halt and we will talk peace, and food for the hungry and growth for the small nations and help for suffering humanity.

Let aggression persist and I pray and hope that you, my beloved Norwegian-American neighbors, will write to our President and let him know that in this hour of tribulation we are one and indivisible, because we are all free and freedom is not divisible.

What a fitting remembrance of this day it would be if you would take the time to write to your President on this Constitution Day—Children's Day—and say to him and to Vice President Humphrey, and, yes, to Senator Dirksen, too:

We unite with you. Whatever the price of preservation of freedom may be, we are determined to resist aggression in southeast Asia and in America. We, the Norwegian-Americans who love liberty, cherish dignity, and despise tyranny, pray that our foes will fail, but we shall not falter in defense of freedom.

To you, the sons of Norway, my neighbors, Norwegian-Americans, today I would close with a quotation from the great Norwegian novelist, Arne Gaboré, who wrote of his people:

"They are a stormy, stubborn folk who dig their way through a life of brooding and care, putter with the soil and search the stars, force a little corn from the earth and hopes from their dreams—put their faith in the penny and trust in God."

Today your hopes and my hopes, your dreams and my dreams, your faith and my faith, for together as children we trust in God.

## BANK MERGERS

(Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. FARNSEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Congress enacted the Bank Merger Act in 1960 with the intention that the control of bank mergers should be regulated by those Federal agencies who had specialized knowledge in this field—the Federal banking supervisory agencies.

This intention of the Congress has been thwarted by recent judicial decisions. The effect of these decisions is to place the final decision on bank mergers with the Justice Department. Under the present system, there have been repeated incidents where a bank merger has been approved by all the necessary Federal bank supervisory agencies only to be subject to litigation by the Justice Department. This lack of consistency and guidelines cannot be considered an aid to banking stability in this country.

In one recent case the Justice Department attacked a merger that had existed 3½ years before final court decision declared it invalid. Coherent bank merger



May 17, 1965

10292

policy is, therefore, becoming non-existent.

I am submitting a bill which asks for regulation of banks. And that we determine once and for all that the intention of the Bank Merger Act be complied with—that we leave regulation to the agencies who have expertise in this area—the Federal banking agencies.

# DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

(Mr. POOL (at the request of Mr. FARNSELEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, many Americans may be puzzled by the rush of events recently in the Dominican Republic. Why, they may wonder, are U.S. paratroopers and marines on guard in a tiny land whose people are our friends, not our enemies?

But there are enemies there: Enemies which threaten not only our friends in the Dominican Republic and Latin America, but our own national security.

They are subversion, totalitarian doctrine, and the insidious work of Castro-type Communists in Latin America.

Fortunately, President Johnson has seen this threat and acted courageously to combat the real enemies of the people of the Dominican Republic and the free countries of our hemisphere. And fortunately, an overwhelming majority of Americans support his actions.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD three competent and informative editorials on this matter; they appeared in the May 8 Burlington Free Press; the Portland Oregonian of May 4, and the Houston Post of April 30:

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 8, 1965]

## JOHNSON DOCTRINE DEFENDS FREEDOM

President Johnson's modern version of the Monroe Doctrine proclaims that the United States will not tolerate the establishment of another Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere. This is called the Johnson doctrine, and it is being proclaimed with a minimum regard for world opinion and a maximum regard for American freedom and security.

We strongly approve of the Johnson doctrine. Our only regret is that such a doctrine was not proclaimed by President Eisenhower or President Kennedy. If it had been, Castro's Red totalitarianism would not be a threat to hemispheric democracy today.

The power of the United States is the only major deterrent to Communist enslavement of the entire world. The United States must not hesitate to use that power whenever necessary to discourage Communist aggression. Power which is claimed, but not used, is not much of a deterrent. Totalitarians respect power when they know it exists; they pay little attention to vacant threats.

This is not to say that the United States should use its power nervously in response to every Communist probe. But it should use its power convincingly in the defense of vital interests—and the security of this hemisphere from Communist totalitarianism is a vital interest.

The Johnson doctrine promises to spare the world a lot of grief. It should have been proclaimed sooner.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, May 4, 1965]

## NO SECOND CUBA

The American people should support President Johnson's decision to use military force as well as diplomatic negotiations to prevent the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere.

Fidel Castro, who brought Communist rule to Cuba, has been infiltrating "14th of June" revolutionaries into the Dominican Republic for years. President Johnson sent marines and paratroopers to Santo Domingo initially to evacuate Americans and other nationals. But U.S. forces were increased, and engaged the rebels, when the President became convinced that the revolt initially intended to return exiled President Juan Bosch to power had been taken over by Castro Communists.

The United States fell into Castro's trap in Cuba, initially welcoming his defeat of the Batista dictatorship, then recoiling in the face of the bloodbath Castro gave the Cubans to establish his own dictatorship, finally realizing that Castro was a Communist and fully intended to communize the nation.

President John F. Kennedy's historic mistake was the withdrawal of U.S. air and sea support for the Cuban exile army slaughtered at the Bay of Pigs. This led to the placement of Soviet missiles with nuclear warheads in Cuba and the U.S. blockade and threat of invasion which forced Nikita Khrushchev to withdraw the missiles.

To allow Castro communism to take over the Dominican Republic would be to repeat our Cuban errors and to meekly sanction the spread of aggressive communism to other Latin American areas. The security of the United States is directly at stake, if President Johnson's premise is correct—i.e., that the Castro Communists have seized control of the revolt in Santo Domingo. So is the security of every other nation in the hemisphere.

What needs now to be explained to the people in both North and South America is the factual evidence on which President Johnson based his action and his statement that the United States "cannot, must not, and will not" permit establishment of another Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere.

Juan Bosch, the Dominican Republic's elected President who was displaced by an Army revolt and a civilian-military junta, bitterly rejects President Johnson's premise. Other Latin American leaders have spoken out against U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic as an "invasion." The Organization of American States has a five-man team in Santo Domingo, but it is almost certain that it cannot deal with the revolutionists.

In every Latin American nation there is a pro-Communist, pro-Castro force awaiting its chance to seize power. Furthermore, Latin Americans generally are fearful of U.S. imperialism and intervention. Some leaders who secretly support U.S. action in the Dominican Republic are afraid to say so publicly. They, too, need strong evidence of Castro-Communist control of the revolt to give them courage.

And if the heavily armed civilians in Santo Domingo can be forced to disarm, there must be early fulfillment of President Johnson's pledge of democratic elections. Can Mr. Johnson guarantee that? One doubts it, but every effort must be made to bring the OAS into command of the situation, reluctant as these governments may be to appear to be on the side of the United States, the Dominican military chiefs, and the feudal landholders who survived the Trujillo dictatorship and the Bosch reform regime.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Apr. 30, 1965]

## MARINE LANDING BLOCKS CASTRO

Despite denials that the possibility of a Castro-Communist takeover was the real reason for President Johnson's sudden decision to land U.S. marines in the Dominican Republic, some things are so obvious that they do not need to be stated publicly or officially.

If the danger of Cuban-Soviet intervention was not a factor in the decision, it certainly should have been, and the President would have been less than alert to the possibilities.

The situation was made to order for a Castro enterprise. In fact, it was an invitation that the bearded Cuban leader and his Moscow masters could hardly resist, if indeed they did not have something to do with instigating the military uprising which produced the chaos, confusion, and a temporary vacuum. They would have been drawn to it as flies to honey.

At the same time, because of the sensitivity of all Latin Americans to any kind of U.S. action that even appears to be intervention in the affairs of another country of the hemisphere, it was only prudent and good sense for the President and his spokesmen to be very careful not even to mention Castro or Cuba in their public statements.

Two Members of Congress who attended the White House meeting prior to the President's announcement have been quoted as saying that William F. Raborn, who had been sworn in only a few hours before as the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, emphasized at the meeting the danger of Cuban-Communist action if the United States did not act to forestall it.

The report later was denied at the White House, where it was said that the President's public statement of the reason for the landing, protection of American and other foreign nationals, was the only reason given the legislators.

The Cuban-Communist danger, however, was so obvious that there really was no need for it to be stated.

The fact is that the public had been wondering all along if Castro and his Moscow backers had not had some hand in launching the rebellion by young army officers, who said they wanted to restore ousted President Juan Bosch to office.

There were reports that some of the rebel leaders were sympathetic to Castro if not actually his agents and that there had been some movement into the country recently of Dominican Communists trained in Cuba and Czechoslovakia.

In any case, there was danger that, if quick and decisive action was not taken, the Dominican rebellion would degenerate into a civil war in which Castro and his backers certainly would become involved. By landing marines, the United States served notice that it would not stand by and let this happen. Castro was blocked, whether this was a consideration or not.

If further foreign intervention is necessary, however, it is preferable that it be by the Organization of American States, and the promptness of that body in reacting to the Dominican situation gives hope that it will be effective in restoring order and keeping the Communists out.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. GEHALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

10308

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 17, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, negotiations on the contract referred to in this article were dropped by officials of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. because leaders of an extreme rightwing organization, Young Americans for Freedom, so called, threatened to mount a massive publicity campaign and had already made arrangements to spend large sums of money on urging a boycott against the purchase of Firestone tires. Here is a dastardly wrong perpetrated by narrowminded, bigoted, self-appointed vigilantes who consider themselves super-duper patriots. They did a disservice to their Nation. Their action not only injured the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. but was to the prejudice of every businessman and of every working man and woman in the great Akron area.

Under Secretary of State Ball will repeat his statement that our Government approves the sale of the synthetic rubber plant to Rumania and had nothing to do with the Firestone action withdrawing from the contract. At the NATO conference in London Tuesday Under Secretary of State Ball said publicly, "Red China is the greatest menace to world peace." Our officials regret that Rumania is now negotiating with West German and English plants for this same contract which would have brought additional employment to Akron workers and additional money deposited in Akron banks.

Who are these so-called Young Americans for Freedom? This extremist, radical, rightwing fringe group was organized in 1960. Five members of the John Birch Society serve on its national advisory board. We know that one of its first directors was an editor of the John Birch Society magazine. We know it is closely associated with other radical rightwing organizations and parrots the lunatic extremeist fringe line. It seems unbelievable and unconscionable that a group playing God with other people's patriotism can intimidate and browbeat officials of a nationally known and respected company with threats of a boycott. No wonder that our distinguished colleague, Senator Tom KUCHEL, of California, an outstanding American, terms these witch hunters "Birchsaps" and "sons of birches." America comes last with these rightwing radical leaders of Young Americans for Freedom, so-called, who, by this sort of action, undermine our national policy and help deny employment to worthy and industrious working men and women and diminish the prosperity of an entire community. It is most unfortunate that this \$50 million contract will be enjoyed by some English or West German firm.

These vigilantes of the extreme radical right, beating their breasts proclaiming their own patriotism, would do better to devote their efforts to provide steady employment and economic security for their fellow Americans. Communism thrives on unemployment, misery, and hunger.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who should know, said:

The Communist Party in the United States has lost 90 percent of its membership since reaching its numerical strength peak in 1944.

Instead of 80,000 Communists, he estimates there are 8,000. Of these 8,000, I suspect a large number are FBI agents posing as Communists. Yet, these rightwing extremists talk about Communists in the State Department, in our universities, and in the Protestant clergy. Not one of these extremists could name one Communist in our State Department, on the faculty of any of our universities, or in the ministry. Former President Eisenhower said of them:

They take extreme positions, make radical statements, attack people of good repute. I don't think the United States needs super-patriots.

These people are self-defeating. These Young Americans for Freedom, so-called, overlook altogether the threat of Communist aggression from behind the Iron Curtain, but let out their Birch barks against fellow Americans, even going so far as to falsely assail officials of a corporation with a great history and tradition such as the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. They proposed to set up a "Committee Against Slave Labor" office in Indianapolis urging a boycott of Firestone tires hoping to damage that company by ruining its normal promotional activities at the time of the Indianapolis auto races.

Behind the Iron Curtain there are 700 million Chinese and 300 million other people living under Communist rule in the Soviet Union and other countries. These billion people will not simply cease to exist. It is for us to seek coexistence or we will likely meet coannihilation. These radical rightwingers term their poison as conservatism. It is contaminated conservatism that would conserve nothing but might destroy basic institutions of our Nation, founded by men and women in search of religious and political liberty.

Our President has urged increased trade with the Soviet-bloc nations. His policy has been affirmed by industrial leaders throughout our Nation, not the least of whom is the newly elected president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

If we are to achieve lasting peace in our modern world, it is likely to be achieved through experiments in cooperation on specific joint ventures between the nations of the free world and those of the Communist bloc. Cooperation in limited areas is the policy I propose.

For example, this Nation and the Soviet Union might work together on some development projects we both favor to help an impoverished country such as India. There should be joint cooperation in the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes, just as satisfying agreements have already been made between our Nation and the Soviet Union to neutralize the vast Antarctic area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, having in mind the welfare of the family farmers of Ohio and of the Nation and the welfare of men and women who work in factories producing goods needed the world over, I urge as a means of easing international tension and at the same time bringing added prosperity to the people of our country that we proceed without delay to establish normal trade relations with Red China and the Soviet Union in nonstrategic goods, selling at the outset to those nations whatever we produce that the Russians and Chinese may eat, drink, smoke, and wear and buying from those nations products which we need and can use and of which we are lacking in this country.

Furthermore, I propose that such trade be made at world prices for cash on the barrelhead and without any special favors or special discrimination. This would bring in needed gold and help end our chronic deficit caused by the outflow of gold by actions of De Gaulle and other allies and by our necessary maintenance of our Armed Forces and thousands of their dependents overseas.

Why should we Americans stand at the sidelines while Canada, Great Britain, Australia, West Germany, and other of our allies trade on a huge scale with the Soviet Union and Red China? Last year West Germany exported more than \$1 billion in goods and capital equipment to Eastern Europe. One-third of France's exports of capital goods according to plans will go to the Soviet Union during the next 5 years. England and other of our allies are not only selling nonstrategic materials in tremendous quantities to Communist countries but are exporting to Cuba and behind the Iron Curtain buses, and other goods termed strategic products.

Ohio industrialists have come to their U.S. Senators seeking assistance in cases where they have lost contracts with Iron Curtain countries for nonstrategic materials to West German, English, French, and Italian competitors. On top of this now come these witch hunters, threatening a ruinous boycott.

It is unconscionable that West Germany, France, and Italy attain full employment and enjoy unparalleled prosperity in large part as a result of their trade, while we, their ally and protector, are depriving our businessmen and workers of the opportunity to engage in this trade and are losing markets which in the near future may be of much greater value.

APP OF GOVERNMENT ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I approve of the action taken by President Johnson in sending troops to the Dominican Republic. It was necessary to take this action to preserve the present and future security of the United States. However, it is regrettable true that the lives of our boys who are being killed in this conflict are no different than those that are lost in a great world war. They, too, have but the one life to give for their country.

STAT

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 17, 1965

## DASTARDLY ACTION OF RIGHT-WING EXTREMIST GROUP

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently on the front page of the Washington Evening Star there appeared an almost unbelievable feature news story. To me it was shocking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing recently in the Washington Evening Star entitled "Firm, Facing Boycott, Drops Rumania Deal," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 8, 1965]

UNITED STATES EMBARRASSED: FIRM, FACING BOYCOTT, DROPS RUMANIA DEAL  
(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Faced with the threat of a boycott campaign by a conservative organization, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. recently halted negotiations to sell Communist Rumania a \$50 million synthetic rubber plant even though the deal had the official approval of the U.S. Government and the personal blessing of President Johnson.

Because Firestone ended the talks only a few weeks before the final contract was to be signed, it was a blow to Rumania's planned economy, and a severe embarrassment to the State Department.

The aborted deal and the boycott threat have received little public attention because none of the interested parties—Firestone, Rumania, or the State Department—has wanted to say much about it.

However, from information on the public record and from confidential disclosures by diplomatic and rubber industry sources, it was learned that the conservative Young Americans for Freedom, almost single-handedly caused giant Firestone, the Nation's second largest rubber manufacturer, to drop the deal.

The incident demonstrates anew that trade with Communist countries is a major political problem for many U.S. firms, even when such deals have the encouragement and approval of the U.S. Government.

It also points up why President Johnson's special committee on East-West trade said yesterday in urging more such trade, that the U.S. Government "should act to remove any stigma from trade with Communist countries where such trade is determined to be in the national interest."

The Firestone story began on June 1 last year when the United States and Rumania signed a joint communique to improve relations between the two countries. The talks were initiated because the administration's experts believed that Rumania, although an ally of Russia, was charting a more independent course in foreign affairs, part of which was an increased trade with the West.

## COMMUNIQUE PAVED WAY

The communique paved the way for Rumania to purchase a synthetic rubber plant from any American company that would sell to it.

For years, Rumania had sought to buy such an industrial plant. A major oil producer, Rumania knew that synthetic rubber is a convenient and profitable byproduct of petroleum. Rumanian officials, as long ago as 1960, had offered to spend more than \$100 million to buy such plants in this country.

For a long time, the Defense Department argued against selling the Rumanians such an advanced technology, but finally, because such technologies are now widely available in Europe, and because Rumania was no longer a close ally of Russia, the Pentagon

agreed with the State and Commerce Departments that such a sale would be in the national interest.

It was argued that the sale would encourage Rumania to go further in its independent course.

## RUMANIAN EXPERTS VISIT

Soon afterward, top Rumanian experts toured many American firms, including Goodyear, the Nation's biggest rubber manufacturer, and Firestone.

In late November, Rumania and Firestone entered into final negotiations for a \$50 million plant.

Both Rumania and Firestone claim experts from Bucharest chose the Firestone process, and that Goodyear, in addition, had certain legal problems involving its process that made it almost impossible to sell to the Rumanians.

Goodyear however, said it was offered the Rumanian contract, but rejected it as not in the U.S. national interest.

On December 8, in fact, the "Wingfoot Clan," Goodyear's house organ, published an editorial saying that "even to a dedicated profitmaking organization, some things are more important than dollars. Take the best interests of the United States and the free world, for example. You can't put a price tag on freedom."

## LISTED SEVERAL REASONS

The editorial went on to list several reasons why Goodyear turned down the Rumanian contract. It said that Goodyear "stood firmly on the side of freedom, as a foe of aggression \* \* \* ever, though the company stood to lose financially."

Some conservative organs began contrasting Goodyear's "patriotic" refusal to sell, with Firestone's obvious willingness. They did not mention that last summer President Johnson determined it was in the national interest of the United States to sell the plant, and authorized the Export-Import Bank to grant normal 5-year credit guarantees for industrial sales to Rumania.

The conservative criticisms began to pick up in February, after the escalation of the Vietnam war. It was the Young Americans for Freedom, a college-age conservative organization which claims 25,000 members, that led the anti-Firestone campaign.

## OUTLETS PICKETED

David H. Jones, the national director of the YAF, which has its headquarters at 514 C Street NE, said his group became involved when local chapters in Philadelphia, Brooklyn and Providence began picketing Firestone outlets.

The YAF people handed out flyers which said:

"In South Vietnam, Americans are being killed daily by Communist bullets. It would be disastrous for American companies to supply the atheistic Communist governments with valuable materials, especially rubber, which the Reds must have to wage their war on free nations."

"In the past month, Communist Rumania shipped 100 heavy-duty trucks of military value to Red China, the principal supplier of the North Vietnam Communists."

"The synthetic rubber plant which Firestone plans to build in Communist Rumania parallels the steel which the United States sold to Japan prior to World War II. America got that steel back—at Pearl Harbor. No nation can wage war without large quantities of synthetic rubber."

## QUOTES GOODYEAR ORGAN

After quoting Goodyear's house organ, the flyer said: "Firestone's plans to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania can only strengthen the Communists and throw away American jobs."

It urged people to protest to Firestone in Akron, Ohio.

The chairman of the Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, chapter of YAF, Thomas F. Harrison, was quoted in the organization organ as saying that a petition drive to get signatures to stop the Firestone deal "is an opportunity for everyone to do something positive in support of an anti-Communist policy; Goodyear deserves the praise and encouragement of all freedom-loving Americans."

The campaign apparently caught Firestone officials off guard. Many franchised dealers whose concern is strictly with selling tires asked Firestone to get the conservatives off their back, since they were losing business to Goodyear.

Firestone sent its Eastern region public relations man, Bernard Frazier, to speak to YAF leaders in different cities. Frazier was described by those who listened to him as a sincere individual who believed Firestone was acting in the national interest by "building bridges" to Eastern Europe, as President Johnson has urged.

Firestone also spread the word that some Rumanian trucks and tractors, photographed in Red China had Goodyear tires on them, and that Goodyear, with Commerce Department approval, had been selling synthetic rubber (but not plants) to Rumania.

Goodyear has denied it knowingly sold such tires to Red China, and says Peiping might have purchased them somewhere on the black market.

The Firestone publicity campaign, deliberately handled in a low key, failed to sway YAF. Even appeals by Firestone to certain conservative Senators and Representatives failed to halt the YAF activity.

Jones says it is very possible Firestone decided to call off the deal with the Rumanians when it learned of the YAF's plans to set up a "Committee Against Slave Labor" office in Indianapolis the week before the Memorial Day, Indianapolis 500 auto race.

YAF planned to mount a massive publicity campaign urging a boycott of Firestone tires which it was hoped would ruin Firestone's normal promotional activities at that time.

Jones says plans were made to hire airplanes to fly over the track with streamers against Firestone.

"A top Firestone executive heard about this on April 18," Jones said. "Two days later the deal was off."

All Firestone said publicly was the following:

"The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. has terminated negotiations for a contract to design and equip a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania."

## UNITED STATES INFORMED EARLIER

The State Department was told about the collapse of the negotiations about 2 days before it was publicly announced. This was about the same time Rumania heard about it.

On April 19, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball called in Rumanian Ambassador Petre Balaceanu to repeat that the U.S. Government still approved sale of the synthetic rubber plant, and had nothing to do with Firestone's decision.

Because of great State Department sensitivity over the issue, Ball's meeting with Balaceanu was not announced to the press. The State Department did not want to appear as having a direct interest in the Firestone-Rumania deal, since it already had been attacked by conservative groups for "ordering" Firestone to sell to the Communists.

Originally organized 4 years ago, YAF worked on behalf of defeated Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater.

Recently, YAF members picketed the White House in support of Johnson's Vietnam policies—one of the few student groups in favor of the escalation of the war.



May 17, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10309

Mr. President, a rather touching article dealing with this subject was published in the Washington Evening Star of May 15. The article, written by Arthur Hoppe, is entitled "Encouragingly Light Casualties." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 15, 1965]

## ENCOURAGINGLY LIGHT CASUALTIES

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The photograph in the news magazine showed the body of a marine lying in the back of a truck, his combat boots hanging limply over the tailgate. The caption said merely: "One of 13 American dead."

There may be a few more by now. But on the whole our casualties in the Dominican Republic have been, as one military spokesman put it, "encouragingly light."

Yet you couldn't help wondering briefly who this dead marine was. And, if you had an idle moment, perhaps where he came from. And whether his parents were still living. And if he had a girl friend. Or a wife. Or even children. And how they had taken the news. And who killed him?

But it was good to know our casualties have been encouragingly light.

The photograph didn't show his face. But the odds are he was young. Maybe he grew up in a small town with long, hot summers and a dusty main street. Or maybe on the hard sidewalks of a big city. He must have played one-o'-cat in a schoolyard somewhere and teased girls and blown candies out on a birthday cake. Most boys do. And he was probably killed by a rebel sniper.

Most of our casualties have been from rebel snipers, though they've been encouragingly light.

But you can't blame the rebel sniper. Not really. He thought he was fighting for liberty. Or maybe communism. Or possibly just to save his own life. And anyway, he must have been acting on orders from his sergeant or his captain. But you can't blame the captain. It was a tactical problem. If he placed his snipers here and the marines came this way \* \* \*. Perhaps some marine officer failed to see the trap. But they haven't made many such errors. For our casualties have been encouragingly light.

You certainly can't blame the Dominican generals on either side. They are engaged in a civil war, a power struggle to crush each other—each doing his duty to save his country from the other at all costs. We are fortunate our casualties have been encouragingly light.

Some may blame the Communist leaders—Kosygin, Castro, or Mao—for trying to take over the rebel cause. But, even if true, they were concerned only with the strategic problem. If they could seize control of this square on the chessboard, thus putting pressure on us here, thereby causing us to \* \* \*. Killing a few marines would do them little good. And our casualties have been encouragingly light.

Some may blame President Johnson for sending the marines to intervene. Yet it is a vital square, deep within our "sphere of influence." And in the game of global strategy such a square is worth great risk. And look what a victory we've won. For our casualties have been encouragingly light.

So no one's to blame. Not really. And now we will bring him home. And now we will bury him in flag-draped coffin with a fusillade of rifle shots, just as we always do. For whoever he was, he is now a dead hero.

No, no one's to blame. And yet as you glaze idly at the photograph of his sprawled

out body, you can't help wondering, however briefly, who this dead hero once was. And what he wanted to be.

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRANCES PERKINS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of the greatest women in the history of the world passed away on May 14, 1965—Hon. Frances Perkins. She was the first woman Cabinet member. She served with great distinction as Secretary of Labor and brought great pride to women everywhere. She proved the potential of women as executives and Government officials.

I was personally very proud of Frances Perkins. I was proud of her because she lived in Maine and counted Maine as one of her homes. I was proud of her because she was my personal friend. We were of different political parties but she always gave me great support.

I was very proud of Frances Perkins as a woman. Her achievements and her career were a source of inspiration and challenge to me.

But I was proud of, and grateful for, Frances Perkins most for the very warm human being that she was and for the dedication of her life for the betterment of all human beings, especially the working people. She truly made this a better world to live in.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point an editorial in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## FRANCES PERKINS

Frances Perkins provided the most concise summary of the turbulent years in which she served so ably as Secretary of Labor. "Almost the entire period of the Roosevelt administration," she wrote, "was marked by difficulties in normal relationships between workers and employers. It must be remembered that from 1933 to 1945 we were always in a crisis."

Coming to Washington at the pinnacle of a distinguished career in the State government of New York, Frances Perkins was plunged into seething controversy. There were times when it appeared that labor and management could cooperate only in venting their spleen upon the Secretary of Labor. But Madame Perkins, who wore simple black dresses and tricornered hats, could not be easily intimidated. In a self-effacing style, not always emulated by her fellow Cabinet officers, she worked ceaselessly and effectively to establish a foundation for peaceful labor relations.

Long before her death, the tower of social legislation that Frances Perkins worked so hard to build became just another profile in the skyline of this industrial democracy. The building blocks include old-age and survivors' insurance, unemployment compensation, minimum-wage and maximum-hours legislation and the Federal regulation of child labor. They are monuments to a splendid lady.

## MERCHANT MARINE WEEK; WORLD TRADE WEEK; NATIONAL MARITIME DAY; 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to draw the attention of my

colleagues to the forthcoming observance, May 17-24, 1965, in Washington, D.C., of Merchant Marine Week, World Trade Week, National Maritime Day and the 15th anniversary of the U.S. Maritime Administration.

I take special pride because a feature role in this program will be taken by an institution close to my heart, the Maine Maritime Academy, one of the Nation's finest institutions of merchant marine officer training. The academy's training vessel, the *State of Maine*, largest ship ever to navigate the Potomac, will be in Washington throughout the week.

Also on board the *Maine* will be cadets from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, New York State Maritime College, Massachusetts Maritime Academy, and the Texas Maritime Academy. In addition, alumni from these five academies have joined together in arranging a splendid program of social and educational activities while the *Maine's* 300 cadets are in Washington. It is a heartwarming display of interacademy cooperation which bodes well for the future in our expanded efforts to foster a resurgence of the American merchant marine.

The *State of Maine* will be open to public inspection at the U.S. Naval Gun Factory each afternoon, Monday through Saturday, from 1:15 to 4:30 p.m. and I urge you to take this opportunity for a firsthand look at our merchant marine officer training program.

While you are aboard the *Maine*, I suggest that you also inspect the Maine products show afloat, an industrial-agricultural exhibit containing goods from downeast forests, farms, and factories. Overall sponsor of the Maine products show is the Maine World Trade Council, a private organization, with assistance of the Maine Department of Agriculture, the Maine Department of Economic Development, the Maine Maritime Academy, and scores of our fine Maine business firms.

The Maine products show, though new to Washington, has been a feature on the training vessel for several years. It began when the Maine Maritime Academy trustees sensed that the annual winter cruise to foreign ports had become valuable to the State's promotional program. Trips to South America, Caribbean, the Mediterranean, and Europe have produced significant results in the export field.

Governor John H. Reed, of Maine, has said:

Maine is proud that the U.S. Maritime Administration has invited our Maritime Academy training ship to Washington to highlight this State's progress and its economic goals.

Merchant Marine Week will officially open Tuesday morning when Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson dedicates a new merchant marine exhibit in the General Accounting Office Building. The same morning Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY will present a \$500 award to the winner of a national high school poster contest commemorating National Maritime Week—the poster now appearing on mailtrucks throughout the coun-

10310

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 17, 1965

try. Our fine Maine Maritime Academy band will play at this ceremony.

On Wednesday the Maine Band and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Glee Club will perform on the steps of the Senate; that afternoon our Maine group will appear at the annual Maritime Recreational Association picnic at Rock Creek Park. Thursday evening our Maine musicians will play at the Sheraton Park Hotel at which time Mr. Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, will address the Propeller Club of the United States.

Saturday, Maritime Day, will mark another first in Washington, as crews from all five maritime academies compete in an old-fashioned lifeboat rowing race on the Potomac River, off Hains Point. The race is scheduled for 2 p.m., and I recommend it to you. There are excellent facilities for spectators.

Evenings during the week, the *State of Maine* will be the scene of a series of social events, culminating with a gala dancing party for cadets on Saturday evening.

This unprecedented salute to the merchant marine came about through efforts of Maritime Administrator Johnson, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and reflects our administration's concern with the problems of the maritime industry.

We from Maine are most pleased that our Maritime Academy was able to solve the many problems involved in bringing the training vessel to Washington. We are ever mindful of our historic kinship with the sea, and are proud to be members of a growing team whose objective is a merchant marine second to none.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EXCISE TAXES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am confident that each of us who has spoken, worked and voted for the repeal of the various excise taxes welcomes the President's ambitious yet realistic proposal to cut about \$4 billion worth of these pernicious taxes from our tax system.

The regressive nature of excise taxes, in that their burden falls most heavily and most unfairly on persons of low and moderate income, has long demanded that as a matter of simple justice these taxes be repealed.

Now, after many years and after many strong but ultimately futile efforts, we are assured success in our fight against excise taxes because the President has joined with us.

We have ample time to consider and approve the President's recommendations before July 1, so the changes can go into effect at that time.

I hope, indeed I am sure, that Congress will take full advantage of this golden opportunity to abolish these so-called temporary taxes.

#### VISIT TO WASHINGTON BY PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today Washington will be honored by a visit from the President of the Republic of Korea, the Honorable Chung Hee Park.

He arrives with good news for the United States: South Korea seems at last to have turned the corner of recovery, on the road to economic independence. Since 1960, its production index is up 60 percent; and its exports are up fourfold—from \$30 million to \$125 million. They are expected to continue upward to \$170 million in 1965, and to equalize at \$300 million by 1967.

Korea is now self-sufficient in cement and electric production and in plywood and refined oil, and is almost self-sufficient in chemical fertilizers. Coal production has doubled in 5 years. Consumer production is way up.

I know that President Park's welcome here will be a warm one; and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published this morning in the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 17, 1965]

#### WELCOME VISITOR

President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of Korea, who arrives here today for a state visit, represents a country and a people who deserve more from history than it has accorded them.

Korea, with a long cultural tradition, has been successively occupied and ravished by its two big neighbors, China and Japan. Today, because of the world conflict between communism and anticommunism, Korea is divided in two on the map, many Korean families are divided in two, both physically and emotionally, and the country's economy is pitifully held back because most of the industry and power sources are in the Communist north while most of the food growing is in the non-Communist south.

President Park's South Korea, a land where even tree growth is denied on the barren, forbidding mountainsides, has suffered from the additional handicap of bitter struggles for political power. The latest coup attempt occurred within the past 10 days.

President Park, who as a general headed a military coup himself 4 years ago, resigned his commission and stood for popular election in October 1963. His civilian administration since then has been torn between trying to permit the opposition characteristic of a democracy without letting this opposition get so out of hand that government becomes impossible.

Lately, the President has taken two bold steps in the international field which have been very pleasing to his host, President Johnson: He has pressed for a normalization of Korea's relations with its old Japanese enemy in order to give Korea a badly needed economic booster; and he has dispatched 2,000 troops to South Vietnam in order to assist the Vietnamese-American effort there.

In coming here, President Park will doubtless want renewed assurance that the U.S. aid program will not be tapered off too abruptly. He also reportedly will want to see faster progress on obtaining a status-of-forces agreement from the United States. Such an agreement would enable his country to establish its sovereign authority over civil air crimes that may be committed by the 50,000 U.S. troops now stationed in Korea.

Fortunately President Johnson, although canceling last month the scheduled visits of Indian Prime Minister Shastri and Pakistan President Ayub, allowed President Park to come on. No doubt the President was persuaded that as hard-plugging an ally as President Park and the Republic of Korea deserved priority treatment.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF IMPORTED MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution—adopted by the Minnesota House of Representatives—requesting Congress to enact legislation which will cause imported meat and meat products to be identified as such to the ultimate consumer of such products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION REQUESTING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION WHICH WILL CAUSE IMPORTED MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS TO BE IDENTIFIED AS SUCH TO THE ULTIMATE CONSUMER OF SUCH PRODUCTS

Whereas there has been much concern by the Congress and by the various States in regard to honesty in labeling; and

Whereas the American housewife may have a preference in meat produced domestically, whether for reasons of taste or from a desire to assist in the economic betterment of the domestic producer; and

Whereas these housewives or any other consumer should be entitled to know the origin of any meat or meat product she purchases; and

Whereas it appears that attempts by States to identify these products is inconsistent with sound marketing procedures as well as U.S. trade policies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation which would cause all meat and meat products imported into the United States to be identified as such to the ultimate consumer of those products so that they may be compared to domestic products by the consumer on a fair and equitable basis; be it further

*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives send copies of this resolution to all members of the Minnesota congressional delegation and to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

Adopted by the house of representatives this 5th day of May 1965.

L. L. DUXBURY, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

G. H. LEAHY,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### THE YOUNGER GENERATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, most of us have read, at one time or another, articles and stories indicating that today's younger generation of teenagers is heading pell-mell toward destruction, or to use a description of an earlier day, "going to the dogs."

Riots on a Florida beach make big news, for example. But I would submit that a beach riot—or worse, attacks by gangs of young hoodlums upon innocent citizens—are far from typical of today's younger generation who tomorrow will be our community and national leaders.

For every wild youngster causing trouble in an Easter weekend riot, there are a hundred like him in church on that same Sunday, some attending services, others participating in the teaching of Sunday school, for example.

For every punk wielding a knife in a subway, or running with a gang on the city streets, we have dozens of dedicated young men wearing the uniform of our

JSE

10281

U.S. AID AND SPECIAL FAVORS DO  
NOT STOP COMMUNISM

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars in U.S. aid and special favors to Dominican sugar interests failed to stop the onward march of communism in that small republic. United States dollars do not buy friends or guarantee stable governments.

I certainly supported the administration stand on sending American troops to the Dominican Republic to protect American life and property. However, the basic mistakes were made over a period of years. These were mistakes that started at the Bay of Pigs and were compounded by mistakenly aimed foreign aid and economic trade concessions ever since. We never got at the basic cause of Communist subversion emanating from Castro's Cuba, and now we are forced to join together in actions that should have been foreseen and prevented.

While we purchased \$265 million worth of sugar from the Dominican Republic over the past 3 years, the United States also spent over \$280 for every family on that island. U.S. direct aid in grants and loans has totaled approximately \$140 million since we again granted diplomatic recognition to that country in early 1962 when the last remnants of the Trujillo regime were ousted. While we poured money and Peace Corps volunteers into the country, the Communists concentrated on undermining the few gains that had been made.

I would also like to point out the unwise policies that were used in allotting a sugar quota to the Dominican Republic and how those policies added to the load carried by U.S. consumers and taxpayers in supporting that unstable Dominican Government. It is interesting to note that the average imports of Dominican sugar over the past 3 years is over 2,000 percent greater than it was 10 years ago, while our domestic sugarbeet growers are being asked to take a 6-percent reduction in acreage this year. The American farmer and taxpayer are paying the bill for the misguided effort to make the Dominican Republic the showplace of the Caribbean. Not only did it not become a showplace, except in U.S. mistakes, but the American farmer who deserved and cried for increased sugar acreage found himself further mired at the bottom of the U.S. economic ladder.

Sugar and the Dominican Republic constitutes only one of the many examples to be noted in our misdirected foreign policy. The extent to which highly paid lobbyists have effectively promoted foreign commodities in the Halls of Congress has been identified in the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings of 2 years ago. I severely question the results of such transactions and pressurings when our efforts fail to halt subversion and succeed only in hurting American business and agriculture at the expense of the Nation's consumers and taxpayers.



10282

CON

I recall my warnings of almost 3 years ago during debate in the House of Representatives over the increase in the Dominican sugar quota. It was called the Honeybee bill, but our prediction of that day has been tragically proven that the only honey was for lobbyists and foreign interests, with nothing but the sting left for the United States.

#### SYTTENDE MAI

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, 151 years ago today the Norwegian Constitution was adopted. It, like the Constitution of the United States, was destined to live through years of stress and strain only to survive stronger than ever as a representative of the free people. The similarity does not stop there. The proud Norwegians also fly a flag of red, white, and blue.

Known to those of us with some Norwegian ancestral ties as "syttende mai"—Independence Day in Norway claims the same significance as our own Fourth of July. The only difference, perhaps, is that the Norwegians still celebrate it in a somewhat more revered way.

While it is a celebration of fun and merriment, it starts soberly in church. Norwegians are a religious people and many of us in this country received our firm religious background from those rigid traditions.

The prayers for this day are of thankfulness for deliverance from the evils that have threatened, but never conquered, these people. We recall the history of world turmoil that has seen Norway assaulted in the 1930's and who struggled throughout World War II displaying unmatched courage in combat, working with the free underground. The determined people of this comparatively small country struggled to reconstruct their homeland and emerged triumphant once more. That banner of red, white, and blue waves this very day on the border of the Communist empire as an emblem of courage and determination.

We in Minnesota, where a great number of Americans of Norwegian ancestry live, have an even greater tie with Norway in our history. It is believed that a mass defection from the Norse colonies in Greenland to the North American mainland in 1342 caused an expedition to be formed to search for the lost colonists. At least part of this expedition is known to have explored Hudson Bay, and a party of men were reported to have made their way from Hudson Bay to Minnesota by the direct and relatively easy route along the Nelson River, Lake Winnipeg, and the Red River of the North. The now-famous Kensington Runestone was discovered near Alexandria, Minn., and tells the story of a visit to the area in 1362 by a party of 22 Norwegians and 8 Goths. We, indeed, share pages in history with the Norwegians.

Mr. Speaker, today we salute Norway on their Independence Day—a proud

May 17, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10363

ing at least for myself, and more than a majority of southern Senators who are opposed to this bill, we cannot enter into an agreement to vote at this time.

Is suggested to the leadership that it might be agreeable for us to enter into a limitation of debate on the amendments to the bill in the hope that we might be able to obtain sufficient support from Senators, which would at least remove the constitutional objections that we have been urging since the bill has been up for debate.

Mr. President, this debate has lingered along without too much time taken by the opponents of the bill; but it seems to me that more time is spent by the proponents in an effort to obtain a meeting of the minds as to what ought to be included in the bill.

With the new modification that was suggested this afternoon and the proposed amendment, I am merely judging that it is evident that the proponents have ostensibly come together once again on the issue that gave them the most trouble. That was with respect to the poll tax.

I have not been able to understand why the poll tax should have given so much trouble to the proponents of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under those conditions I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Chair wishes to announce, on behalf of the Vice President, the appointment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as a member to the Eighth Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, at Ottawa, Montreal, May 20-24, 1965, in lieu of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

#### EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it was most pleasing to me to learn that President Johnson is asking the Congress to reduce the Federal excise tax on passenger cars from 10 to 5 percent over a 3-year period.

Reform of the entire excise tax structure is long overdue, and it is heartening to note that the President proposes a complete revision.

On January 6, 1965, I introduced S. 255, a bill to reduce the Federal excise

tax on passenger cars from 10 to 5 percent, over a 3-year period, beginning July 1, 1965.

At that time, I said that it would be unconscionable for any reform of our excise tax system not to include a reduction of the onerous 10 percent tax on new passenger cars, which is the only major excise tax that has not been changed since the Korean war.

It is most gratifying to me that the President, in his message to the Congress today, is following the three-stage excise tax reduction first proposed in S. 255.

I hope the Congress will act quickly and favorably on this recommendation, which should save the buyer of a new car about \$75 on the purchase price. The fact that the proposed excise reduction would be retroactive means that it should not have a depressing effect on car sales while Congress is considering the matter. The auto industry has promised to pass on any reductions to the car-buyer.

On only one point do I find myself in disagreement with the President. In his message, he recommends that the auto excise tax remain at 5 percent once that level is achieved.

It has long been my position that this restrictive tax should be repealed and I will continue to work for that goal.

#### SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. [REDACTED] nearly 3 weeks ago the cauldron of discontent in the Dominican Republic boiled over.

I am convinced more and more each day that only the U.S. prompt response to the new crisis on that bloody soil could have provided the basis for what we all hope and expect to be a meaningful peace through the auspices of the Organization of American States.

The mercurial events on the island of Hispaniola continue to present problems of vast magnitude—but they can be solved if all of the nations of the OAS give more than lip service to the responsibilities of an interdependent hemisphere.

It has been said that nothing can stop an idea whose time has come. I respectfully suggest that the time has come to implement an idea which I have advocated consistently since 1955—the establishment of a permanent inter-American police force.

The concept of interdependency is one which we have long accepted in Europe. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson only recently acknowledged the importance of NATO and the political-military solidarity of our allies in Europe.

NATO has had its problems but it is a working, living force. In Asia, SEATO has been less viable but it cannot be dismissed.

Even in South Vietnam, where at times we seem to have been carrying on a lonely if honorable campaign to save a nation from communism, we have recently been joined by our friends in Australia, South Korea, and the Philippines who recognize that democracy is not a closed shop.

It was on January 21, 1955, that I first advocated the establishment of an inter-American police force to assure peace and stability in Latin America.

This was long before Fidel Castro betrayed the Cuban dream. Only a year before, however, Guatemala had undergone turmoil and upheaval and it had become clear that laissez faire in the Americas was no longer possible.

For it was evident that communism, like nature, abhors a vacuum.

In my 16 years in the Senate, Mr. President, I have made more than 300 speeches on Latin America. Time and time again, I have emphasized that a commonality of responsibility required the establishment of a hemispheric patrol to police this part of the world so that people of the Americas could pursue their own destinies free from international conspiracy.

Of course, the nations of this hemisphere had agreed in the Rio Treaty of 1947 that "an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states," and each of our countries pledged to "assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations."

That treaty attested to the integrity of the inter-American system.

This was bolstered in 1948 by the act of Bogotá, when 21 nations chartered the Organization of American States; in 1954, by the Caracas resolution—which prohibited Communist intervention in this hemisphere—by the Declaration of Punta del Este in 1962 and other acts.

But most of these solemn and meaningful pacts called for consultative actions.

None had yet created the "ready room" atmosphere that an international peace patrol could provide.

Article 6 of the Rio Treaty, for instance, recognized that there could be an aggression without armed attack—yet called not for a standby emergency force but said only:

The Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken.

The Organization of American States Charter also called for consultation. Similarly, the Caracas agreement specified a "meeting of consultation to consider adoption of appropriate action."

In truth, each of these agreements gave an intellectual nod to the concept of subversion, but in reality organized to meet that threat largely on a parliamentary plane—the kind of basis which accommodates itself to the measured tramp of armies but not to the hidden terrorist.

The OAS did provide a stable forum for the discussion of hemispheric policies. It continued to be the organization which, in the long run, will carry out the noble intentions of its members. But to do so requires implementation.

In the Dominican crisis, the OAS—acting as swiftly as circumstances would allow—nevertheless took exactly 1 week to reach agreement on what to do in this situation. It has dispatched a peace

STAT

May 17, 1965

commission and is making every effort within its present capabilities to restore domestic tranquillity.

That is exactly what the United States of America wants the OAS to do, and what our allies of the hemisphere desire.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, whom Latin Americans know to be simpatico, said in a May 5 speech that the OAS must develop and maintain international peace-keeping machinery, and warned that the days of "luxury and ease" for the OAS are gone.

Again, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said in a May 8 interview with the Associated Press that it has become imperative that the OAS consider establishing a standby military force in order to be able to cope with contingencies that arise with speed and which present massive threats to the entire corpus of the hemisphere.

In that regard, I would respectfully point out that some years ago I suggested an inter-American police force working under the Organization of American States would put an end to military takeovers that continue to raise the unpleasant specter of tyranny.

In a speech on April 7, 1960, I pointed out that establishment of an inter-American security force would permit Latin American countries with tremendous internal problems of employment, housing and sanitation to spend less for national armies and more for badly needed social welfare programs.

In turn, the establishment of domestic progress would mitigate against military juntas and in favor of true popular Government.

In 1960, when I again advocated the international security force, I had just returned from a tour of 10 nations in Latin America.

I reported to the Senate Commerce Committee, of which I was then a member, that in the Caribbean, Panama was seething with unrest, Cuba was in the "grip of a bloody-handed leftist dictatorship" and the people of the Dominican Republic, after 30 years of despotic rule, still lacked at that time the most elementary aspects of political freedoms. Haiti was also struggling with abysmal poverty and a repressive government.

"Clearly the fuse is burning very close to the bomb," I reported.

At that time, there came the first indication that the State Department was studying the feasibility of an inter-American security force.

Even then, the Dominican Republic looked to Fidel Castro like fertile ground for the export of communism. The adjoining nation, after all, had gone through 22 revolutions in 70 years and had long been under the thumb of Rafael Trujillo.

Among Castro's earliest acts was an attempt in 1959 to invade the Dominican Republic with an expeditionary force.

But our national attention turned from the Dominican Republic to Cuba itself as Castro's link with Soviet communism became more and more obvious and threatening.

During this period, the Organization of American States met many times. There were solemn discussions, agree-

ments, resolutions, and sanctions invoked.

How many of us here recall that it was in July of 1960 that Russian Premier Khrushchev was blatant enough to say that he considered the Monroe Doctrine had "outlived its time, had died, so to say, a natural death."

Thus managed from Moscow, Castro began to churn the Caribbean. From a point 90 miles off U.S. shores, within a few minutes air time from Santo Domingo, Castro began his attempt to subvert the hemisphere.

Even then, however, there was purist sentiment for upholding to the letter article 15 of the OAS Charter—which prohibits intervention by any state in the internal or external affairs of another.

The Caracas agreement notwithstanding, there were those within the hemisphere who deemed a hands-off policy to be the highest order of political enlightenment.

Yet the Cuban threat magnified, repression grew, the link with Russia became more blatant.

Mr. President, no man ever respected the integrity of the Americas more than our late President, John F. Kennedy. No man wanted more to work closely with the Organization of American States than he.

Yet President Kennedy also knew the limitations of the OAS—and the burdens of the United States. He was well aware of article 15 of the OAS Charter.

And yet he was also attuned to the magnitude of the Castro threat and determined that the United States would not, could not, allow it to remain.

Because our President, agonized over the right and proper course for the friends of freedom, acting by rule of law, circumstances led us to the unfortunate Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961.

It failed, and, afterward, President Kennedy stated:

Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of non-interference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation. Should that time ever come, we do not intend to be lectured on intervention by those who character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest.

There came, in the ensuing months, the Declaration of Punta del Este and, it may be remembered, the congressional resolution of September 26, 1962, in which the Senate voted 86 to 1 to prevent "by whatever means may be necessary, including use of arms" the extension of the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba to any part of the hemisphere.

But it was in the missile showdown of October 1962 that President Kennedy demonstrated that U.S. patience indeed had limits, and he acted with firmness and resolution and success.

It was true that he consulted with the OAS, but, in the final analysis, it was the United States—with its great military force—which was acting as policeman

for the hemisphere in the Cuban missile crisis.

Today, once more, we stand in the Dominican Republic as a policeman—if that be intervention then I would recall the words of former Panamanian President Roberto Chiari, who observed that if nonintervention is carried to its most extreme interpretation it can condemn to continual and incurable oppression those peoples deprived by force of their legitimate quest for self-determination.

But let us look at the timetable of events in the Dominican Republic to see exactly what the United States did.

On April 24, a group of young Army officers and civilians seized two radio stations and announced intention to topple the U.S.-supported junta of Donald Reid Cabral and restore Juan Bosch to power.

By April 25, forces loyal to General Wessin y Wessin were resisting the rebels.

The situation rapidly deteriorated. Arms were distributed by the rebels to the general populace. The streets became bloody lanes and effective government disappeared.

As armed bands roamed the streets, there was looting and burning. U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett tried in vain to restore peace, but by April 28, the situation was so critical that he cabled President Johnson:

You must land troops immediately.

Lives of more than 1,000 U.S. citizens in Santo Domingo were clearly threatened when, on the evening of April 28, President Johnson ordered 400 marines ashore.

The President called in the leaders of Congress and he informed the Nation by television. The OAS was summoned together the next day and—it is interesting to note—declined to send a mission to the Dominican Republic but instead cabled the Papal Nuncio at Santo Domingo and asked him to seek a cease fire.

Subsequent events have indicated the U.S. action came when it was absolutely necessary to prevent an irreversible situation.

We acted—because there was danger to our citizens, because there was substantial evidence of Communists converting the rebellion to their own purposes—and because, in the final analysis, there was no one else to defend the integrity of the hemisphere at that time and at that moment.

As the President himself said to the National Association of Home Builders on May 11:

We would rather that men quarrel with our actions to insure peace than curse us through all eternity for inaction that might lose us both our peace and freedom.

Many of our Latin American allies have voiced criticism of our action in the Dominican Republic—yet agree privately that it was a wise decision, consistent with hemispheric goals.

I was in Panama 1 week ago, and my conversations there lead me to believe that there is broad individual support for the U.S. role in the Dominican Republic.



May 17, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10365

Hindsight, however, tells us that had we established the permanent international security force even 4 years ago, the technical question of intervention would not arise at this point—for each of the partners in this hemisphere would have been carrying his share of the responsibility.

There is no better time than now to give the Organization of American States the power—which the United Nations already has—to muster cooperative international forces to keep the peace.

I firmly believe such a force for the Americas must be permanent, that it must have the flexibility to respond to emergencies and to function as long as it is necessary to assure peace and stability consistent with the goals of self-determination.

To paraphrase Santayana, those who do not remember history are condemned to relive it.

Mr. President, there have been a number of editorial comments on the Dominican Republic crisis that I believe are particularly cogent. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a column written by the noted commentator Eric Sevareid, which was published in the Washington Evening Star, for May 11, and excerpts from recent editorials in papers around the country.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE, 20TH CENTURY  
(By Eric Sevareid)

President Johnson has enlarged the war in southeast Asia by bombing the territory of a foreign government with which we are not legally at war and he has invaded the territory of a Latin American country without benefit of an invitation or even the prior approval of other hemisphere governments in the Organization of American States.

Domestic critics have said that he has made an ex post facto rationalization of the bombing by emphasizing that North Vietnam is the vital source spring of the fighting in South Vietnam. Domestic critics now argue that he similarly rationalizes the Dominican intervention by emphasizing what evidence there is that Communists were taking over the people's uprising.

There are surface similarities between the two actions, but they remain on the surface. They need not and ought not be lumped together by the President's detractors or by his supporters. Critics of his Asian policy may well turn out to be wrong in the end, but there are much stronger grounds for this criticism than for criticism of his action in the Dominican Republic. Vietnam lies very far away from the United States and very close to a major power that just might enter that war. The Dominican Republic lies very close to us, very far from any other great power and carries no danger of international war.

What deeply puzzles those who are dubious of our Vietnam policies is how we are to make a "victory" there work over the long haul, how that area, riven by tribal and sectarian rivalries, with almost no national consciousness, is to be kept stable and in one piece. The Dominican Republic is far more able to usefully employ economic assistance and does have a strong national sense, however bitter its class enmities. Our aims there have much more chance of realization.

The OAS is a useful entity; we ought to consult it before we act if circumstances

make it safe to do so. In the Dominican situation affairs were moving much too rapidly, as, in 1950, the North Koreans were moving much too rapidly for President Truman to throw out the question of American intervention for congressional debate. It would be very nice, indeed, if we could always act by the book. But we cannot always do so in this new era of the quick Communist coup. We cannot because no Latin American government is politically or militarily able to act quickly in concert with us. If it is not too strong a word, that is the hypocrisy built into the Organization of American States. Its other members can share its protection; they will not, because they cannot, share the ultimate responsibility of action.

The New York Times, which President Johnson privately refers to as a "yes—but" newspaper, seems to be sad that because of his quick intervention we will never know whether or not the Dominican uprising was falling into the hands of the Communists or not. There are worse sorrows, as Castro has demonstrated to us.

The Dominican Republic is not going to be the last of our dramatic difficulties in this hemisphere, even though the President has used it as an example of what to expect, for the benefit of Latin Communists. And we will save ourselves a great deal of moral and intellectual agony as the future unfolds if only we can clear from our minds certain bits of debris:

1. The notion that the development work of the "Alianza" is the true alternative to physical action to stop communism. In the long, long haul—perhaps several decades—this is probably correct, but Communists in those countries are lighting very short fuses.

2. The notion that all military regimes in Latin America are equally bad. The truth is that in some Latin countries educated, modern military leaders are quite as enlightened and responsible as their political opposite numbers. We simply cannot equate the military now trying to put order into Brazil or the military who took over Peru and produced the free election they had pledged with military characters like a Trujillo or a Batista. Progress without stability is an impossibility and the bitter truth is that in some Latin countries there are times when the sole element of stability is the military.

3. The notion that the United States is reverting to the "big stick," gunboat diplomacy that characterized the earlier third of this century. We are not. There is nothing in Latin America that we want to conquer or possess; and we no longer swing our weight for any pleasureable sensations of fancied moral or racial superiority. Times have changed in another respect: we are now up against an international conspiracy that seeks to unravel from within societies that do not possess the social glue that comes from a long tradition of functioning democracy.

It is a fearful commitment the President has made. We shall prevent, by force if necessary, the establishment of another Communist regime in this hemisphere. It is the Monroe Doctrine, 20th century edition, harder to fulfill than the original version, but even more relevant to the realities.

Boston Globe: "The Soviet Union's attack on the United States in the U.N. Security Council will presumably center on the charge that our intervention in the Dominican civil war was only a pretext for establishing a rightist dictatorship there.

"This of course is not true. Sending in the marines was a necessary act of humanitarianism, as the harrowing stories of these evacuated attest.

"It is undoubted that Castroite Communists are seeking to take over the revolution."

Atlanta Constitution: "The use of U.S. military forces in Dominica was a grave move. It required careful and deliberate courage to make that decision. Mr. Johnson made it and in so doing demonstrated prudent leadership—the kind of leadership we need in today's world."

Boston Traveler: "The United States need make no apology for sending troops into Santo Domingo to protect American lives when local authority broke down there."

New York Post: "President Johnson's address last night on the U.S. role in the Dominican crisis exhibited a sensitive concern for the decent opinion of mankind.

"Franklin Delano Roosevelt faced a similar Caribbean challenge in the first days of his Presidency when the Machado dictatorship was overthrown in Cuba. He surrounded the island with warships and mobilized the marines but he knew the day of single-handed intervention was over. Instead of landing the marines he moved toward a policy that made hemispheric peace and security the joint concern of the whole continent. A similar challenge and opportunity still confront Mr. Johnson."

Daily Oklahoman: "The U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic rebellion suddenly has become a key test in the entire cold war.

"The policy upon which we have embarked is to say that there will be no more Castro-type takeovers. Our justification can be that if our intervention is a mistake, that can be rectified later, whereas a Red takeover precludes any later change by peaceful means."

Dallas News: "In President Johnson's recent report to the Nation on the situation in the Dominican Republic he laid it on the line. To the Communists he gave notice that this hemisphere in general and this country in particular do not intend to see another neighbor nation enslaved by the Red colonialists.

"To the many demagogues around the world who have gained political capital by inciting violence against American lives and property he gave clear warning that such activities can no longer be launched in the certainty that the U.S. Government will not protect its own.

"Lyndon Baines Johnson is no great orator but he is a very effective speaker because his words are blueprints for action. We know it and the world is learning."

Philadelphia Inquirer: "Joint action by nations of the Western Hemisphere, utilizing the administrative and diplomatic machinery of the Organization of American States, offers the best hope of resolving the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

"As President Johnson said in his televised report to the American people Sunday night, 'We have acted to summon the resources of this entire hemisphere to this task.' He defended his decision to send U.S. troops to the Dominican Republic, without waiting for OAS action, on humanitarian grounds. 'I knew there was no time to talk, to consult or to delay,' the President emphasized. To have hesitated would have been to condemn countless men and women to 'die in the streets.'

"The peril in the Dominican Republic is precisely the kind of crisis in which the Organization of American States is solemnly pledged to respond. Such response should have solid support from the United States and other OAS members and should be sufficiently firm to assure both peace and freedom for the Dominican people within a framework of self-government free of foreign dictation from any quarters."

Memphis Commercial Appeal: "Use of American troops in the Dominican Republic, and President Johnson's words giving justifications to that act, will make history.

"More than that they will provide guidelines for U.S. policy for untold years to come.

"Lyndon B. Johnson has enunciated what must inevitably become known as the Johnson doctrine. While the immediate purpose of this doctrine is to prevent Communist encroachment, the broad terms are amazingly consistent with the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

"The Johnson doctrine, like its precedent, is not aggressive. It does not infringe on the independence or sovereignty of any other American state. It does not make protectorates of them. It invites change—even revolution—if the impetus for change is internal.

"But Mr. Johnson identified communism for what it is—an outside force aimed at dictatorship. And the Johnson doctrine is very plainly an enforcement of U.S. and hemispheric interests against a real and present danger to hemispheric peace and security."

Houston Post: "That trained Communist leaders moved in and took control of what started as a pro-Boche revolution in the Dominican Republic, the suspicion confirmed by President Johnson Sunday night, should have surprised nobody.

"Consistent Communist policy and strategy required that they do this. So did the logic of the current international situation. In any case, it was too good an opportunity for them to pass up.

"President Truman met his test in Europe and Korea. President Eisenhower met his principally in the Formosa Straits and the Middle East. President Kennedy met his in Cuba and in southeast Asia, and when he showed he was willing to risk a nuclear holocaust the Communists again paused.

"President Johnson is now undergoing his test, and in some ways the assault upon him is more virulent, more intense, and more savage than that against his predecessors in office. Any show of weakness, irresolution or indecisiveness would, of course, be exploited by the Communists to the maximum. How long it will take to convince the Communist leadership that he is just as tough, firm and resolute as his predecessors in office remains to be seen.

"In the Dominican Republic no less than in Vietnam and Laos, President Johnson has met the Communist test or challenge with firm, positive and unflinching action. If the Communists have not by now got the answer to their question of what they can hope to get away with while he is in the White House, they are really rather dense."

Portland Oregonian: "The American people should support President Johnson's decision to use military force as well as diplomatic negotiations to prevent the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, recently, the able and distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] made an enlightening and informative speech at the State convention of the Oklahoma Junior Chamber of Commerce at Tulsa, Okla., on the Dominican Republic crisis in support of the position of our President on the action he has taken to contain communism in this hemisphere.

I am certainly in accord with the views which the Senator from Oklahoma has expressed, and believe that he has made a great contribution toward enlightening the American people on the existing situation.

The speech is one which I believe should receive the full attention of every Member of Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPEECH OF U.S. SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS TO OKLAHOMA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT THEIR STATE CONVENTION, SATURDAY, MAY 8, TULSA, OKLA.

The Dominican Republic occupies a part of a small Caribbean island near our shores. It is a country of only 3½ million people with an area comparable to the little State of Connecticut.

Yet, today, the situation in that tiny country and the actions our Government has taken there have great impact on all our lives, and, perhaps, the future peace and security of this hemisphere.

The prompt action of President Johnson in sending troops into the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of American nationals, and, particularly, to prevent the establishment of another Communist country in this hemisphere establishes, in effect, a new policy doctrine.

So far, only one critic, the representative of Uruguay to the Security Council of the United Nations, has given that new policy a name. Last Tuesday in a speech before the Security Council, calling for the removal of American troops from the Dominican Republic, the representative of Uruguay called the new policy "the Johnson doctrine."

I believe it will come to be called that, admirably, by those who are in agreement with the policy. It will come to be recognized as an important elaboration and extension of the Monroe Doctrine.

I supported the action of President Johnson in sending troops to the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of our citizens and to prevent Communist takeover of that country.

In the age of the ICBM and the communications satellite, it can truly be said that every part of the world is of immediate and vital strategic interest to the United States.

Yet it is as true today as it has ever been that there are some areas in which this Nation has a deeper inherent concern than it may have in other parts of the world. Such an area is our own immediate neighborhood—the Western Hemisphere. We are linked to the people of this hemisphere by many bonds. Like us, their nations are relative newcomers to the world scene. Like us, they have fought, and fought hard and long, to secure, and then to maintain their national independence, although they have faced difficulties in marshaling their total resources to the task of raising the standards of living of their peoples.

It is the tragedy of this hemisphere—a tragedy which we feel, and in which we have not been entirely blameless—that the hopes of this proud and freedom-loving people have not been fully realized, even to this day. In past years, this Nation has, too often, looked upon Latin America as an area in which our basic interests gave us the right to intervene in their internal affairs in order that they might be arranged to suit our convenience or transient wishes.

That era is behind us, now. It is behind us forever. The day has gone when the United States, with all its power and might, can casually or for light reasons, attempt to dictate its will to the people of this hemisphere. We are no longer—if ever we were—the landlord of the Western Hemisphere. We are, and we hope to remain, the partner of a group of sovereign nations—a group whose objectives, I hope and believe, will usually be in accord with ours—but a group whose friendship we will have earned and whose cooperation will come freely from the uncoerced recognition of a community of interest.

In the early years of this century, the United States thought itself free to occupy the Dominican Republic, to order events there in line with our own ideas—and free to leave when our objectives were achieved, without giving much thought to the aftermath.

The aftermath of that American occupation was one which stands forever to the discredit of the United States, and one which we cannot lightly dismiss from our conscience. I refer, of course, to the bloody and incredibly repressive dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo—a dictatorship which made the Dominican Republic a prison for its people and an affront to the hopes and aspirations of Americans of all of the American republics.

Today American troops are again in the Dominican Republic. But today they are there with a far different mission, and we stand obligated to see that the results of our necessary intervention are of a totally different order than was the case 30 years ago. In the words of President Johnson: "It is our mutual responsibility to help the people of the Dominican Republic toward the day when they can freely choose the path of liberty and justice and progress. This is required of us by the agreements that we are party to and that we have signed. This is required of us by the values which bind us together."

The choices which suddenly confronted the Government of the United States less than 2 weeks ago, were agonizing ones. There were no easy alternatives, and few simple black-and-white conclusions. The democratic government which the Dominican people had established after the death of Trujillo had long since vanished, a victim partly of its own inadequacies, partly of some of the tragic legacies of the Republic's long night of dictatorship. An effort to overthrow the military junta that had replaced Juan Bosch had begun, and between the many groups that sought to direct this revolution and the efforts of others to prevent it, effective government collapsed in the streets of Santo Domingo.

For several days, the United States and other American governments watched the events in the Dominican Republic with great care. No one in our Government viewed lightly the possibility of American intervention. If the Dominican people had been able to order their own affairs, to secure and safeguard the free, democratic constitutional government which they sought, we would, in my judgment not have intervened. But the people of the Dominican Republic were not to be allowed to have that simple choice.

Trained, dedicated Communist leaders—a number of whom have now been clearly identified—sought to take advantage of the situation and to turn the legitimate desires of the Dominican people to the service of the purposes of those who would establish a Communist dictatorship on that island.

Our Ambassador had made a complete report concerning the facts of the new direction in the revolution brought about by Communist leaders moving into positions of rebel strength and influence.

Among the rebel forces, and playing an important role in organizing the mobs, are 55 identified, prominent Communists and Castroist leaders. They include 18 persons known, or reliably reported, to have been trained in subversive and paramilitary tactics by the Cuban Intelligence Service or other similar Communist organizations. The balance of the Communist leaders there have been reliably and clearly identified over the past years as Communist and Castroist subversives.

It became probable, and was so reported, that if the rebels were successful in taking over the government, the Dominican Republic would shortly become a Communist state.

This government, and all the free governments of the Americas, have learned the hard, dangerous way, that we cannot suffer the establishment of another Communist dictatorship in this hemisphere. We have learned that as contrary to the spirit of the American Republics as military juntas may be, they represent a danger less immediate,

May 17, 1965

less mortal, than allowing another beachhead for the Communist movement in this part of the world.

In 1958 and 1959 and 1960, we allowed one such beachhead to be established in Cuba and become a source of mortal peril for all of us. The world was brought, in October 1962, closer to the brink of the ultimate war by that fact than we ever hope to come again.

As the efforts of the junta and the revolutionaries to seize power in the Dominican Republic teetered back and forth, order vanished. On Wednesday, April 28, the chief of police in Santo Domingo advised the American Ambassador that he could no longer guarantee the safety of the Embassy or of the thousands of Americans and other foreigners present on the island. At that critical juncture, the President of the United States, alone in the awesome responsibility which that office imposes upon its incumbent, had to make a decision. As he has himself said, delay itself would have been a decision—"a decision to risk and to lose the lives of thousands of Americans and thousands of innocent people from all lands." His decision was unavoidable, and his promptness in making it may have been the reason that thousands of American homes are not today mourning the death of a loved one.

He ordered American forces into this chaotic situation in order to save American lives. This they have done. And they have succeeded magnificently.

It was, indeed, unfortunate, as our Ambassador to the Organization of American States made clear, that there was not in being some peacekeeping force under the authority of the Organization of American States which could have been sent in to the Dominican Republic instead of U.S. forces alone.

The responsibilities in the situation, therefore, became apparent for the United States. Having taken action, we notified the Organization of American States as rapidly as possible and asked them to take responsibility for the peacekeeping operation. Our suggestion has now been approved.

In early morning hours of last Friday, after lengthy debate, by a vote of 14 to 5, with 1 abstention, the Organization of American States decided to take responsibility for keeping the peace in the Dominican Republic and to send in troops from the member nations for this purpose. It is hoped that when the military situation has been stabilized and peace restored, the Organization of American States within a year will be able to supervise free and open elections for the reestablishment of a democratic, responsible government in that troubled island.

As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, I believe the action of the Organization of American States setting up for the first time a peacekeeping force to fill a power vacuum in a Latin American country, to bring about stability and peace and to prevent a Communist takeover is, in itself, a real advance in Latin American affairs. Hopefully, this collective action will set a pattern for the future of working together to insure the security and independence of Latin American countries.

America's action in the Dominican Republic has brought sharp criticism from many areas throughout Latin America and may have given some additional impetus for the moment to Castro's anti-American offensive wherein he has most recently joined with others in calling our actions "gunboat diplomacy."

This was the risk our Government had to take, because the other alternative was much worse. In the long run, allowing the establishment of a new Communist country in Latin America would have given far more

impetus to communism and Castro, and the critics of the hour would have been far outweighed by the criticisms of history.

It is not the policy of this Government to dictate to the Dominican people the kind of a government they shall have. It is most emphatically not the purpose of the United States to shape the future of the Dominican Republic. And it is not the policy of this Government to allow agents of the Communist conspiracy to deny to the Dominican people their liberties and their hopes for progress and stability.

Most of the beginning revolutionaries, as newspaper accounts have made quite clear, and as our Government is fully aware, were not Communists or Communist sympathizers. On the contrary, most were motivated by hopes for a constitutional and democratic system under which their country could follow the quest for justice and progress—under which their fellow citizens could be free to hold and to voice their free judgments about their country's government.

Most of them were probably as bitterly opposed to a dictatorship of the left as they are to a dictatorship of the right—more bitterly opposed because a dictatorship of the Communist stripe would have the international support of other Communist countries.

Many of the more moderate revolutionaries soon recognized the increasing danger of a Communist takeover of the revolution and took refuge in foreign embassies. It was to protect them, as well as to protect Americans and other foreigners, that American troops are in the Dominican Republic.

But having gone in—having moved to prevent the betrayal of the Dominican revolution into the hands of the Communists—the United States and the other Republics of the hemisphere have a continuing responsibility there. We cannot now wash our hands of the Dominican Republic, and leave their liberties in the streets for the first opportunity to pick up.

President Johnson has stated our long-range hopes for this freedom-loving people most eloquently. Let me quote from him: "The road is open to you to share in building a Dominican democracy and we in America are ready and anxious and willing to help you. Your courage and your dedication are qualities which your country and all the hemisphere need for the future. You are needed to help shape that future. And neither we nor any other nation in this hemisphere can or should take upon itself to ever interfere with the affairs of your country or any other country. We believe that change comes and we are glad it does and it should come through peaceful process. But revolution in any country is a matter for that country to deal with. It becomes a matter calling for hemisphere action only—repeat only—when the object is the establishment of a Communist dictatorship."

This latter statement is, I believe, the announcement of a new policy, or doctrine, which this country, hopefully with the aid of the Organization of American States, must firmly follow in the future as firmly as it has been announced.

We seek only peace and self-determination for the peoples of the Dominican Republic and of Latin America. We do not seek domination or dominion. Again, the President has made this clear. He said:

"The form and the nature of the free Dominican Government is, I assure you, solely a matter for the Dominican people, but we do know what kind of government we hope to see in the Dominican Republic. For that is carefully spelled out in the treaties and the agreements which make up the fabric of the inter-American system. It is expressed, time and time again, in the words of our states-

men and the values and hopes which bind us all together.

"We hope to see a government freely chosen by the will of all the people.

"We hope to see a government dedicated to social justice for every citizen.

"We hope to see a government working, every hour of every day, to feeding the hungry, to educating the ignorant, to healing the sick—a government whose only concern is the progress and the elevation and the welfare of all the people."

In these words of the President of the United States there is a prescription, not for the discredited techniques of so-called gunboat diplomacy, not for the condescension and proprietary attitude which once tarnished our country's image in this, our immediate neighborhood, but for a policy in which the combined power of all the Americas—military power where necessary, economic power, and above all, moral power, will be utilized to preserve freedom and to encourage progress, and to seek justice for all Americans and for all the Americas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I am pleased that I was in the Chamber to hear the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Florida on the situation in the Dominican Republic, as I was a few weeks ago when he spoke so lucidly on the same subject in a speech which was partly the inspiration for the one I made in Tulsa, Okla., which the Senator has been so kind as to have printed in the RECORD.

I compliment the Senator from Florida on his statement today, and for the statements he has made concerning the situation in Latin America, and particularly in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am grateful to the Senator for his statements.

#### SENATOR CHURCH'S VIEWS ON VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Senator CHURCH has been one of the most outspoken public figures in advocating thoughtful consideration and debate about American objectives in Vietnam. On April 22, I inserted an article by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], entitled "We Should Negotiate a Settlement in Vietnam," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Several editorials have appeared recently commending Senator CHURCH for speaking out on Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have two of these editorials inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Observer, Apr. 15, 1965]

PRESIDENT "GOES TO CHURCH" IN VIETNAM

President Johnson's diplomatic "escalation" of the war in Vietnam has brightened the prospect of a political solution short of the full-scale ground war toward which the United States was headed a few short weeks ago, and it has thereby placed the United States on stronger ground in southeast Asia. But it may not be enough to avert a debacle.



10368

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 17, 1965

In stating for the first time that the United States attaches no preconditions to negotiation with Hanoi or Peiping, the President moved the Vietnamese dispute toward the conference table, where we have some chance of improving our position, and away from the battlefield, where our prospects are slim indeed. The question now is whether the Communists will choose to risk at the conference table the advantage we have given them in the field.

In holding forth his offer of economic aid to develop all of southeast Asia, the President put our policy in perspective once again, reminding the world, and perhaps also his countrymen, of the constructive purposes which, after all, underlies our presence in Vietnam. Our military ventures in recent weeks have all but obscured that purpose, and at times have seemed to replace it. Whether or not the Communists may elect to join us in this enterprise, the President's plan offers the only sound route toward the political stability and independence which should be our objective in southeast Asia.

The President has turned in the right direction, but he may not have gone far enough.

The conference door has been opened, but the Communists are unlikely to enter so long as the U.S. bombings of North Vietnam continue to vindicate the Communist cause, to cement their inner antagonisms and to goad them toward a massive military response with which we would be hard put to deal.

The economic door has been opened, but little will come of that until the United States begins to put its full weight into the long, hard, and expensive undertaking.

The political door has been opened, but the U.S. public, still largely deluded by the vain quest for a final military answer, must yet learn to live with compromise and accommodation. U.S. policymakers still must grope their way toward a workable and enforceable political arrangement which will safeguard our interests, as well as the interests of others, in southeast Asia. This will be no easy task.

But a start has been made. Perhaps he did so too late, but the President at last has put his seal of approval on a policy which makes sense. It is essentially the same policy for which others, including Idaho's Senator FRANK CHURCH, have been denounced as heretics because they had the foresight to grasp it earlier and the courage to speak up for it.

S.H.D.

[From the Emmett (Idaho) Messenger-Index, Apr. 15, 1965]

## VOICE OF DISSENT

One measure of democracy's strength is the freedom of its citizens to speak out—to dissent from the popular view.

So says a footnote to the Saturday Evening Post's biweekly feature, "Speaking Out," and it is a truism that can never be overemphasized in a society where conformity is at once its strength and its greatest weakness.

In the April 24 issue of the Post, Idaho's senior Senator FRANK CHURCH pursues his conviction that "we should negotiate a settlement in Vietnam." He marshals powerful logic to support the view that our deepening involvement in the Vietnam war will have the ultimate effect of extending Communist China's influence through southeast Asia.

The Senator contends that steadily increasing strikes to the north can only drive North Vietnam into Peiping's arms, which it now loathes, and may eventually bring Chinese armies in a Korea-type war involving tens or hundreds of thousands of casualties instead of hundreds.

He says only the South Vietnam people themselves can win or lose what essentially is a civil war, and that although we have invested some prestige there, the struggle

by no stretch of the imagination can threaten the life of our country.

The article merits thoughtful and careful reading.

In the Vietnam matter, Senator CHURCH has no illusions about his being the voice of dissent. He knows that the popular view does not now support his deeply held convictions, and rumor has it that his speaking out has brought down on his head the wrath of the President.

History may never record with certainty whether Senator CHURCH is right or wrong, for the sweep of events, in whatever direction they take, invariably find their own rationalization and their own justification. The schoolboy can find no indictment in the history books. If American policy ever has been misguided or shortsighted, the lone voices that rose in timely dissent have long since been muted and lost to all but the careful scholar.

But this is not to say that timely dissent is without influence. It often speaks with greater power than the bland voice of popular conformity, for it speaks from the deep force of conviction that conformity often finds missing.

It already has become apparent that Senator CHURCH's voice of dissent has exerted powerful influence over national policy. In his recent "unconditional discussions" speech, the President has adopted a position advocated by Senator CHURCH all along, whether or not L.B.J. is willing to concede any credit to F.C.

It is likely, indeed, that in his courage to speak out strongly with a minority view, FRANK CHURCH has done more than any man in the United States, including the President, to clarify our perspective of the complex entanglement in Vietnam.

If because of this the President is displeased with Senator CHURCH, it is a discredit to the President and not to the senior Senator from Idaho.

A man whose integrity clings to fully considered convictions in the face of majority opposition is a man of great courage. If at the same time he speaks out in reasoned dissent, he influences the headlong and sometimes heedless rush of history.

Senator CHURCH's dissent already is vindicated. Time might well prove that his lone voice has been a critical factor in turning America away from disaster.

And time also might show that if the Senator remains steadfast, the Presidential displeasure will be transformed into greater respect and admiration.

Mr. CLARK. My own view is that the Senator from Idaho has had a very real influence in the modification of our foreign policy in Vietnam. I commend him for his earnest efforts in the cause of peace.

## HENRY J. TASCA NAMED AS AMBASSADOR TO MOROCCO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that President Johnson has appointed Henry J. Tasca, of Philadelphia, to be our Ambassador to Morocco.

Mr. Tasca is a loyal alumnus of South Philadelphia High School, and attended Temple University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the London School of Economics.

It is greatly to Mr. Tasca's credit to note that this 11th of 11 children is the son of an immigrant tailor who came to Philadelphia from the Umbrian region of Italy many years ago.

I am happy indeed to note the fine career of this distinguished Philadel-

phian; and I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin for April 25, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENVOY TO MOROCCO IS LOYAL SOUTH PHILADELPHIA GRADUATE

(By Anthony Day, Bulletin Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The career diplomat President Johnson has chosen to be his new Ambassador to Morocco is a passionately loyal alumnus of South Philadelphia High School.

It was at the school (class of 1930) that the President's nominee, Henry J. Tasca, the 11th of an immigrant tailor's 11 children, learned 3 elements of a diplomat's education: Languages, chess, and democracy.

He later studied economics at Temple University, the University of Pennsylvania and the London School of Economics. Add to this acquired knowledge a natural talent for persuasive reasoning, a vigorous constitution, imposing looks and a gentle manner, and you have the formula that made a successful diplomat of a poor boy from South Philadelphia.

## TRIBUTE TO AMERICA

Tasca, 52, is unabashedly proud of his rise from an obscure origin to a high rank in the foreign service of the United States. He is now Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. He expects to go to Rabat, Morocco, in about 6 weeks, after the Senate confirms his appointment as Ambassador.

"It is a great tribute to America that the son of an immigrant can go as an Ambassador to an important country," he said yesterday.

Tasca was born in Providence, R.I. His father, Julius, and his mother, Philomena, came to the United States in the 1880's from the Adriatic coast of Italy across the peninsula from Rome.

## LIVED ON SOUTH 17TH STREET

Julius Tasca brought his family to Philadelphia when Henry Tasca was 7. They settled in a house at 1820 South 17th Street, and lived there during most of the Tasca's boyhood. Several brothers and sisters still live in the Philadelphia area.

The father died when Henry Tasca was 11. The boy went to Vane Junior High School, then to South Philadelphia High. Summers he worked, part of the time he cut cloth at a clothing factory near 7th and Arch Streets.

At the big high school—it was the old building—Tasca excelled in Latin, winning a gold medal for his excellence in the language. (Now he is fluent in German, French, and Italian.)

As for chess—"I think chess is a great thing for any diplomat," he said. "Just as in chess, there is much in diplomacy that demands a very clear notion of consequences. You have to look ahead."

## SOUTH PHILLY DEMOCRACY

The South Philadelphia variety of democracy has Tasca's total allegiance. "It was a great time, a wonderful time," he said as he recalled how the student body was a harmonious mixture of many nationalities.

"We Americans are made in our junior high schools and high schools," he said. "Other people do not understand us until they understand that. We learn in our schools that we've got to be fair. We learn to live together."

After obtaining advanced degrees—and publishing two books on international trade—Tasca spent the war years in the Navy as an economic specialist in U.S. military government. He played an important part in establishing European monetary pol-

A2420

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 17, 1965

No nation offers its citizens more of an opportunity to advance on economic, political, social, and cultural levels than does ours. Every American within and without this Chamber has a duty to strengthen and improve our institutions and to protect the freedom of body and mind that gave birth to them.

One hundred years ago Walt Whitman wrote: "The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem. Here at last is something in the doings of man that corresponds to the broadest doings of the day and night."

Let us look forward to tomorrow with hope, clarity of purpose and new dedication. The years ahead are fraught with danger. We not only have the menace of Communist arms and subversion; but domestic unemployment, poverty, disease, and inequality of opportunity. But I, like you, believe that the United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem. I believe we can overcome the obstacles in our path. I believe our Government is consecrated to serve the will of the people. We must act with courage—not sit transfixed by fear. We must regard the past without regret; we must contemplate the future without alarm. America is on the move, and all of us as citizens, as Democrats, are obliged to serve her well.

### Our Stand in the Dominican Republic

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the editors of our Nation's newspapers have been almost unanimous in backing the policies of President Johnson in his stand against communism in the Western Hemisphere.

As so many papers have noted, we cannot tolerate another Castro in our own backyard.

President Johnson's bold and decisive leadership to the Dominican Republic crisis merits the praise of all Americans. As the May 5 editorial in the Rochester Times-Union pointed out, "Uncle Sam is standing straighter," because of the President's actions.

The Omaha World-Herald, another of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, repeated the President's announced reasons for sending troops to the Dominican island. The United States is there to protect lives and to stop the spread of Communist aggression.

In the long run, peace and freedom owe a debt of gratitude to President Johnson for his timely action.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask consent to include in the Record the editorials from the Omaha World-Herald and the Rochester Times-Union.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald May 4, 1965]

#### ON WITH THE JOB

President Johnson summed up the reason for the presence of U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic in one sentence Sunday night:

"Our goal is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere, and we would like to do this without extensive bloodshed."

The address was an impressive account of the President's reasons for the actions he has taken since the Dominican crisis began, and an equally impressive declaration of our country's intentions.

The decision to intervene in the Dominican fighting came because of the immediate threat to the lives of Americans and other foreigners in Santo Domingo. As the revolution disintegrated into apparent anarchy, the original rebels were "superseded by evil forces." The Communists saw a chance to create more disorder and seize control, the President said, and he added:

"The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

Mr. Johnson chose to act first and then to invoke the official machinery of the Organization of American States to ratify his decision.

There is good reason to hope that his forthrightness in facing up to what he termed "violence and terror and international conspiracy" will serve to rally support in Latin America.

But if events should prove otherwise, if our Central and South American allies should fail to cooperate in the effort to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in the Americas, President Johnson indicated that he is fully determined to go it alone.

That determination was apparent in the concluding paragraph of his report when he said that, come what may, the American people will not be "buried" by their Communist enemy.

If the Communist bosses were looking for a sign of weakness, they did not find it in the President's words.

This time the United States has met a Communist-precipitated crisis head on, without hesitation that might be mistaken for timidity, and without any hint of appeasement.

The President underscored his strong words by ordering more troops into the city of Santo Domingo, not only to evacuate American civilians and others, but to distribute food and medicine, and to bury the dead.

"We must get on with the job immediately," said the President.

Clearly this "job" is no mere rescue operation for American citizens in danger.

It is an operation to rescue another American nation from communism, to prevent another Castro-type takeover. The President's prompt action and his unequivocal words give every promise that the "job" will be done.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, May 5, 1965]

#### PROTOCOL WON'T DEFEND FREEDOM

Uncle Sam is standing straighter.

Through President Johnson's bold action in Asia and in the Caribbean, America has stopped being a musclebound giant, everlastingly frustrated in checking communism's nibbling at the free world.

Direct action in Vietnam to give the Communists second thoughts about aggression and in the Dominican Republic to nip a Castroite plot in the bud—this admittedly is not polite, striped-pants diplomacy.

Some call it "unwarranted unilateral interference in the internal affairs of other countries." Others call it "brinkmanship."

They miss the main point.

President Johnson said last week of Vietnam: "Defeat \* \* \* would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression. It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations \* \* \* within their reach."

And he said this week of the Dominican Republic: "We don't propose to sit \* \* \* with our hands folded and let the Commu-

nists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere."

This has been the theme of U.S. policy for nearly two decades. Unfortunately, it has been applied only in fits and starts. Freedom has suffered many a loss while diplomats haggled and U.S. leaders did too little too late.

Emerging now is a new determination to resist aggression and subversion as the occasion warrants.

America's tactics sometimes may appear distressingly similar to those of the Communists. But the purposes of the opposing forces are as different as the bright sunshine of freedom and the black darkness of tyranny.

America wants not to dictate a form of government but to permit free choice. It seeks not to conquer new territory for itself but to prevent others from expanding their dominion. It wants not to destroy international peacekeeping organizations but only to act when their complex machinery breaks down.

Those who protest that the conflict in Vietnam is just a civil war ignore the plain evidence of Red aggression from the north. Those who argue that the Dominican rebellion would not play into Communist hands forget the duplicity of Fidel Castro.

And to those who cringe at the new fighting, the President replies:

"From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and \* \* \* even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

### Importance of Rural Life in Civilization

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege of representing the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee. A few days ago the Future Farmers of America in their annual State convention meeting in Memphis, Tenn., heard outstanding members of their organization, participate in a speech contest.

Ernest Pounds of Bradford, Tenn., which I have the honor of representing, won the statewide speaking contest. His speech is so outstanding and timely that I felt it should be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

This speech follows:

#### IMPORTANCE OF RURAL LIFE IN CIVILIZATION (By Ernest Pounds)

Honorable judges, Future Farmers, friends, I am concerned about the future of our Nation, not today, not tomorrow, not a decade from now, but a more distant future. Although one of the youngest nations of the world, we are excelled by none. Our national resources seem almost unlimited. We possess more copper, zinc, aluminum, cement, pig iron, steel, and petroleum than any other nation. We lead the world in the production of corn, cotton, total small grain, meat, and milk, making America the leading agricultural nation of the world. With one of the greatest merchant fleets we lead all other nations in both imports and exports. We boast of having the tallest and finest buildings and the greatest network of highways, and of being the wealthiest nation in the world. This Nation has almost as many telephones, radios, television sets, and motor



May 17, 1965

A2419

spent much of his life in the wilderness. He possessed a toughness of spirit and resiliency of character which was best demonstrated by his championing of the cause of the common man. He gave men from all walks of life a chance to participate in politics and in government. His credo was equal opportunity for all.

The heritage of Jefferson and Jackson has extended down to the present, and the result has been that what was considered new and controversial and dangerous in the administrations of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, is today almost taken for granted.

The history of progress in our country is a revolutionary history—not just a revolution of arms and an overthrow of oppressive British rule, but a revolution of ideas, discoveries, and laws. As our Nation has progressed and the dignity of man has been constantly reaffirmed, the Democratic Party has served a great purpose. I think that we might ask ourselves what are we doing now to meet the problems of today and tomorrow.

Our country is undergoing dynamic and rapid changes. Changes wrought by a developing technology, rapid communications, vast population migrations, and spiritual unrest.

We accept man's freedom of will and corporeal independence and yet are confronted by his singular inability to secure his job and his family income against downward trends in the national economy over which he has no control.

We have as a Nation created a fiscal paradox whereby we spend only \$450 a year per child in our public schools, but spend \$1,800 a year to keep a wayward child in a detention home; \$2,500 a year for a family on relief and \$3,500 a year for a criminal in a State penitentiary.

In the past 4 years, under the leadership of two great Democratic Presidents, a Democratic controlled Congress has come to grips with the realities of life for modern man living in an era of social, economic, and political transition. Hard-hitting programs have been enacted to meet the national needs of education, unemployment, civil rights, and air and water pollution.

Just this past month, Congress passed an education bill which is a major step forward in guaranteeing equality of educational opportunity for all children in our land. It authorizes \$1.3 billion in the first year for grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families. Its purpose is to strengthen primary and secondary school education. It is a bill that is needed because over 1 million children drop out of school every year without a high school diploma and because in most poor communities, children are destined to receive a poorer education resulting from a lack of textbooks, school facilities, and insufficiently trained teachers.

This bill was passed by a Congress and signed by a President who knew that unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education is four times that of the national average; that the lifetime income of a person who graduates from high school is \$60,000 higher than one who does not go to high school, and that the lifetime income of a college graduate is \$135,000 more than for one who has only a high school diploma.

This spring was a busy spring for the House of Representatives. We not only passed an education bill of historic scope, but we also voted overwhelmingly in favor of Medicare. It seems strange that there are still so many people in our country who argue with self-righteous fervor that every man ought to be totally responsible for his own old age medical needs. The great majority of people, old or young, do not want to be charity cases. They want to be independent, yet secure in their needs. In our Nation today, we have

18 million people over 65 with the average couple over 65 having an annual income of approximately \$1,700. The cost of 1 day of hospitalization is over \$40 a day. Over 50 percent of our senior citizens do not have medical insurance because they cannot afford it. Many do not go to doctors as the symptoms of disease appear because they are afraid of having their meager savings wiped out. By the time they do see a doctor and are hospitalized, many have passed the point where medical science can benefit them.

The only answer to this dilemma of inadequate medical treatment of our aged is to enable each person during his productive years to put aside a small amount of money so that when he gets to be 65 he will be able to have hospital care without impoverishment or charity. It is important in addition, that an option be given our elderly citizens to allow them to make small monthly premium payments with matching Federal payments so that private insurance may be acquired to pay doctors' fees. This is what the Medicare bill provides. This is why it is good legislation and this is why it will become the law of the land.

We are currently engaged in a bitter and acrimonious war in Vietnam. There are some who are fainthearted and say the United States should pull out. There are others who are overly bold and claim that the United States should begin bombing civilian population centers. In my opinion, the slow and studied escalation of our military activities as directed by President Johnson is the only course of action open to us.

What is the real issue in Vietnam? We certainly are not fighting for the small piece of real estate with wet and fetid jungles. We are fighting for a principle. That principle is that the United States lives up to its international agreements, that we will not give up our military commitments in far-flung areas around the world where the Communists practice naked aggression—that our treaty commitments to fight to defend Western Europe and Berlin are credible. I am reminded of the words of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address: "With malice for none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to know the right." President Johnson and the American people are not interested in a war of aggression in Vietnam. The President has offered to meet the Communist leaders to discuss methods and means of peacefully settling the hostilities. The Vietcong Communists are not interested. They believe they can win the war by force of arms. We have no malice toward the Communists but we are firm in our commitments to South Vietnam because we are right. Our President symbolizes the spirit in America to resist armed conquest by those who have an insatiable thirst for power and that is why all of us in this room tonight along with 180 million other Americans support his courageous stand.

The Congress and President Johnson have not just been concerned with education, Medicare, and Vietnam. They have recognized that the only way we can maintain the vitality and strength of our economy is to have jobs available for all who must work to live. We have to develop and continue programs to train young men for employment in this age of complex technology and to retrain those whose skills have become antiquated. Under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, we have seen new approaches applied to solving old manpower problems. Vocational training programs have been initiated to help those who want to help themselves. Regional recovery programs such as the Area Redevelopment Act and more recently the Appalachia Act, have been enacted to invigorate areas of great poverty and joblessness. An antipoverty program has been created to give employment, training, and

hope to thousands of youth out of school, out of work, and disillusioned by an apparent gray destiny of economic dependency.

Much has been done but much more is required. This year the number of 18- and 19-year-old workers, is expected to increase by 500,000—twice the increase of last year. The labor force is expected to grow by 7½ million workers in the next 5 years—50 percent greater than the last 5 years.

Certain groups face greater challenges than others. Negroes presently constitute 10 percent of our population, yet will account for 18 percent of the coming manpower increase. The level of Negro unemployment is twice that of whites in our society. We can never be satisfied until all races, colors, and creeds, have equal opportunity in all spheres of life.

The prospective and vast increase in our labor force over the next 20 years comes at a time that machines are replacing men at an increasingly faster pace. Automation is desirable in that it relieves man of the drudgery of having to spend all his time scratching out a living from the soil, the mine, or the factory. It gives him time for recreation, leisure, and cultural pursuits. It provides opportunities for man to notice himself and his relationship to his Creator.

Automation does, however, present thorny obstacles and grave dangers to our people. Year after year, throughout our land, productivity per man-hour of work has risen. Fifty years ago, it was considered good if a man could mine one-half a ton of coal in a 10-hour day. In 1965, a miner using the latest equipment can produce 60 tons in an 8-hour day. Over 500,000 jobs a year are lost out of our economy as a result of machines replacing men and the era of a strong willing back being a passport to success has passed forever. It is true that automation fashions new jobs for our people, but the new jobs require new skills and all too often the number of new jobs fashioned does not equal old jobs lost.

What is needed is a strengthening and broadening of college education and vocational education so that the skills of our work force will always match the jobs available in our economy. Counseling and job replacement services must be expanded so that the right man will be able to find the right job. Job development activities must be increased in order to create new service employment opportunities in fields where they have not existed in the past because of an inadequately trained work force. The people of our country want improved home and equipment maintenance, they want greater recreational opportunities for their children and stricter supervision in playgrounds. There is no reason why these services cannot be provided as automation steadily frees more men from work on the farm and in the factory.

What is needed in addition, is a reaffirmation of our cultural and spiritual heritage. It is written in the Bible: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God."

These words have great meaning to a society such as ours. We are a rich nation and our people on the average work but 5 days a week. We have time to reflect on our beginnings and on our destiny. We have time to read, to play, to watch television, to listen to music. Yet with all the free time we have to relax and understand ourselves, we are a country with 10 percent of the people suffering from mental disease requiring treatment and countless more from jangled nerves requiring tranquilization. In a sense, mere life itself within the community of man has become one of our greatest challenges. In future years of automated free time, our churches, colleges, and cultural centers will have a heavy burden to lift from many men the yoke of uninspired existence and restore to them the joy of living.